The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XX. *May, 1914.* *No. 5.*

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—St. Vincent of Lerins, *Commonit, c. 6.*

Published by

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Washington, D. C.

J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,
BALTIMORE.

The
Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XX. *May, 1914.* *No. 5.*

THE SOCIAL JUSTIFICATION OF INTEREST ON CAPITAL.

As we saw in a preceding article, interest cannot be conclusively justified on the ground of either productivity or service. There is no sufficient reason for the contention that the capitalist has a strict right to interest because his capital produces interest, or because it renders a service to the laborer or the consumer. On the other hand, we have seen that a part, probably a small part, of the interest now received can be fairly justified on the ground of sacrifice. Certain existing capitalists would not have saved if they had not had the assurance of interest. In their case interest may be regarded as a just compensation for the sacrifice which they underwent when they decided to save instead of consuming.

Nevertheless, they would suffer no injustice if interest were now abolished. Up to the moment of the abolition, they would have been in receipt of their proper compensation; thereafter, they would be in exactly the same position as when they originally chose to save rather than consume. They could sell their capital, and convert the proceeds to their own uses and pleasures, in which case they would obviously have no further claim upon the community for interest. Or, they could retain the ownership of their capital, and postpone its consumption

to some future time. In that event they would regard future as more important than present consumption; they would look upon the superiority of future over present enjoyment as sufficiently great to compensate them for the sacrifice of postponement. They would have no moral claim to interest on the score of abstinence. Hence the sacrifice-justification of interest continues only so long as the interest continues. It extends only to the interest received by certain capitalists in certain circumstances, not to the claims to interest that might be set up by capitalists in general, or capital in general. Hence it presents no moral obstacle to the complete abolition of interest.

Since the greater part of the interest now received cannot be justified on intrinsic grounds, and since that part of it which is thus justified could be abolished consistently with the rights of the recipients, the institution of interest must be vindicated, if at all, on grounds of social welfare. Would its suppression be socially beneficial or socially detrimental?

The interest that we have in mind is, of course, pure interest, not undertaker's profit, nor insurance against risk, nor gross interest. Even if all pure interest were abolished the capitalist who loaned his money would still receive something from the borrower in addition to the repayment of the principal, while the active capitalist would get from the consumer more than the expenses of production. The former would require a premium of, say, one or two per cent. to protect him against the loss of his loaned money. The latter would require the same kind of insurance, and an additional sum to repay him for his labor and enterprise. None of these payments could be abolished in any system of privately directed production. The return that there is question of doing away with is that which the capitalist receives in addition to these payments, and which in this country seems to be somewhere in the neighborhood of three or four per cent.

Another fact to be kept in mind is that in a no-interest regime capital would still have value, and be bought and sold. At present the value of productive capital is, indeed, determined by the revenue or interest that it yields to its own-

ers. If the current rate of interest is five per cent. a factory that brings in ten thousand dollars net return will be valued at about two hundred thousand dollars. Should it suddenly become incapable of producing anything beyond operating expenses (including wages, salaries, insurance, etc.) its value would sink to zero. It would fetch no price in the market because money paid for it would yield no interest. Capitalists would invest their money elsewhere, in interest-producing concerns.

In a no-interest economy, however, such capital, and all other instruments of production that brought in returns sufficient to cover the costs of production, insurance of the capital, and undertaker's profits, would have a market value. Capital-instruments would be in demand as the indispensable receptacles, as the concrete embodiments, of saving and accumulation. For saving cannot in any considerable amount take the form of cash hoards. In the words of Sir Robert Giffen: "The accumulations of a single year, even taking it at one hundred and fifty millions only, . . . would absorb more than the entire metallic currency of the country [Great Britain]. They cannot, therefore, be made in cash." ("Growth of Capital," p. 152). Consequently the instruments of production would be sought and valued by savers for the same reason that safes and safety deposit boxes are required by the owners of precious articles. They would be in demand as the only means of carrying savings over into the future, and the demand would be sufficiently great to cover the cost of producing them. For example, one man might deposit his savings in a bank, whence they would be loaned without interest to a railroad builder, or a factory builder, or some other director of industry. These capital forms would embody and secure and equal the value of the savings. When the owner of the savings desired to recover them he could be paid from the resources of some other depositor, or from the proceeds of the sale of the concrete capital for which they had been expended. Another saver might prefer to invest his money directly in a building, a machine, or a mercantile business, whence he could recover it

later on through a sale of the property. Hence the absence of interest would not change essentially the processes of saving, investment, production, or any of the other activities connected with the use of capital. Capital would still have value, but its valuation would rest on a different basis. Its value would arise not from its power to yield interest, but from its capacity to serve as a receptacle for savings, and to carry over into the future the consuming power of the present.

The question whether the abolition of interest by the States would be socially helpful or socially harmful is mainly, though not entirely, a question of the supply of capital. If the community would not have sufficient capital to provide for all its needs, actual and progressive, the suppression of interest would obviously be a bad policy. Most economists seem inclined to think that this condition would be realized; that, without the inducement of interest, men would neither make new savings nor conserve existing capital in sufficient quantity to supply the wants of society. Very few of them, however, pretend to be able to prove this proposition. So many complex factors, with regard to the possibilities of saving and the motives of savers, enter into the situation that no opinion on the subject can have any stronger basis than probability.

It is sometimes contended that the present rate of interest is necessary in order to induce the existing amount of saving and capital. For, it is assumed, some of those who now save are unwilling to accumulate capital at a lower rate of interest than that now prevailing. Were the rate artificially reduced they would curtail or discontinue their savings to such an extent that the supply of capital would fall below the demand. Owing to this excess of demand over supply, the rate interest would rise, or struggle to rise, to the former level. Hence the present rate is the socially necessary rate. According to this argument, there is an analogy between the rate of interest and the rate of wages of any group. Of ten thousand men who are receiving five dollars a day nine thousand may be willing to work for four dollars, while the other one thousand require five dollars. If the remuneration be reduced to four

dollars the excess of demand over supply will force the rate back to five dollars, and bring the one thousand five-dollar men once more into the market. The same thing will happen when the high-priced section of the savers, "the marginal savers," discontinue their saving activity on account of an artificial lowering of the rate of interest.

Nevertheless the analogy is misleading. The reason why the "marginal" one thousand wage earners refuse to work for four dollars is because they can get employment on better terms in some other occupation. This is a fact which has been established over and over again by observation and experience. On the other hand, there is no experience, no positive evidence, which shows or tends to show that any important number of present savers would discontinue or reduce their accumulations in case they could not obtain the present rate of interest. Their only alternative would be to spend the equivalent of their present savings for present enjoyment. Now we have no empirical data which justify the assumption that any considerable group of savers would choose this alternative rather than accept, say, two or three per cent. interest on their savings.

It is the present demand for capital that is immediately responsible for the existing rate of interest. Even though all savers and capitalists should be willing to continue their functions at a lower rate, no lower rate will be established so long as the volume of demand stands in the present relation to the volume of supply. From the fact—assuming it to be a fact—that savers and capitalists are now getting a higher rate than is required to induce them to maintain the existing supply of capital, it does not necessarily follow that they will increase the supply sufficiently to bring down the rate of interest. Some of them are unable, while others are unwilling, to save the additional amount.

Even though many of the present savers and owners of capital might diminish or discontinue their function as the result of a fall in the rate of interest, the supply of capital would not necessarily be reduced. The places of these "marginal savers" would in all probability be taken by other per-

sons, by those who would be compelled to increase their accumulations in order to provide as amply for the future as they had previously been able to provide with a smaller capital at a higher rate of interest (Cf. Gonner, "Interest and Saving," p. 72; Cassel, "The Nature and Necessity of Interest." ch. IV).

Professor Cassel contends (*loc. cit.*) that there is a certain important class of savers who would diminish very considerably their savings if the rate of interest should fall much below two per cent. They are those persons whose main object in saving is a fund which will some day support them from its interest. At six per cent. a person can accumulate in about twelve years a sum sufficient to provide him with an interest-income equal to the amount annually saved. For example, two thousand dollars saved and put at interest every year will aggregate in twelve years a principal capable of yielding an annual income of two thousand dollars. At two per cent. the same income cannot be obtained through the same amount of saving in less than thirty-five years. At one and one half per cent. forty-seven years will be required. Therefore, concludes Cassel, if the rate falls below two per cent. the average man will decide that life is too short to provide for the future in this way, and will expect to draw upon his principal. This means that he will not need to save as much as when he sought to accumulate a capital large enough to support him out of its interest.

The argument is plausible but not conclusive. If the rate of interest is so low that a man must save for forty-seven years in order to get a sufficient interest-income, he will, of course, be compelled to use up all or part of his capital in his declining years. Nevertheless it does not follow that he will save less than he would if the rate of interest were higher. The determining factor in the situation is the attitude of the saver toward the *capital sum accumulated.* He either desires or does not desire to leave this behind him. In the latter case he will save only as much as is necessary to obtain an annual income composed partly of interest and partly of the principal. If this contemplated income is two thousand dollars, and the

rate of interest is six per cent. he will not need to save that much annually for twelve years. A smaller yearly saving or the same saving for a shorter period will suffice. But if the rate of interest is only one and one half per cent. he will be obliged to save a larger total to secure an equal accumulation and an equal provision for the future.

On the other hand, if the saver does desire to bequeath his capital he will not entirely abandon this intention merely because he is compelled to use some of the capital for the satisfaction of his own wants. If the man who saves two thousand dollars a year for twelve years intends to leave the 33,333 dollars to his children he surely will not decline to save anything for them when he finds that at one and one half per cent. interest he cannot accumulate nearly such a large sum with the same amount of saving during the same number of years. He will not, as Cassel's argument assumes, decide to leave nothing behind him, and merely save the smaller sum which, with the interest thereof, will suffice for his own future. In all probability he will try to provide a sum which, even when diminished by future deductions for his own wants, will approximate as closely as possible the amount that he could have bequeathed had the rate of interest remained at six per cent. In other words, he will be constrained to save more at the low than at the high rate.

The relative insignificance of the sum which would be available for a bequest at a low rate of interest might sometimes, indeed, determine a person to save nothing for this purpose. With the rate at six per cent., a man might be willing to save six hundred dollars a year in order to leave twenty thousand dollars to an educational institution. With the rate at one and one half per cent., the amount that he could hope to accumulate would be so much smaller that it might seem to him not worth while; consequently he would decline to save the six hundred dollars annually. Cases of this kind, however, refer always to the secondary objects of saving, the luxuries rather than the necessaries of testamentary transmission. They do not apply to such primary objects as provision for one's

family. When the average man finds that he cannot leave to his wife and children as much as he would desire, as much as he could have bequeathed to them at a higher rate of interest, he will strive to increase rather than decrease or discontinue his efforts to save.

Speaking generally, we may conclude then that the assumption underlying Cassel's contention is contradicted by our experience of human motives and practices. Men who save mainly for a future interest-income, at the same time desiring to keep the principal intact until death, and who could have realized this desire under a high-interest regime, will not become entirely indifferent to the latter aim when they find that they can not attain it completely. They will ordinarily try to leave behind them as large a capital or principal as possible.

The foregoing considerations point even more strongly to the conclusion that this class of persons would tend to increase their savings if interest, instead of being decreased, were utterly abolished. Those who were willing to subordinate present satisfactions to the *primary* future needs of themselves and their families would save at least as much for these ends as they would have saved in a regime of interest. Most of them would probably try to save more in order to make their future provision as nearly as possible equal to what it would have been when interest accrued on their annual savings. Whether a person intended to leave all his accumulations, or part of them, or none of them to posterity, he would still want them to be as large as they might have been under the interest-arrangement. This would mean more saving.

What has just been said refers to saving for primary wants, for those desires and satisfactions which are included in a person's established and cherished standard of living and of bequeathing. Men of average foresight and thrift value this class of future goods more highly than the secondary goods of the present. In other words, future necessaries and comforts are generally regarded as more important than present non-essentials and luxuries. Interest or no interest, prudent men will subordinate the latter to the former, and save money ac-

cordingly. However, this occurs only when the two classes of goods differ in importance, when the anticipated satisfactions are more highly estimated than those which might be had today. When both future and present goods are of the same order or kind, this rule of preference ceases to operate. In that case the higher valuation is put not upon the future but upon the present. The luxuries of today are more keenly prized than the luxuries of tomorrow. If the latter are to be preferred they must possess some advantage over the luxuries that might be obtained here and now. Such advantage may accrue in various ways: for example, when a man finds that he will have more time for a European trip two years hence than this year, when he prefers a large amount of future enjoyment at one time to present satisfactions taken in small doses, or when a man puts an unusually high estimate upon future as compared with present pleasures. But the most general method of attributing advantage to the secondary satisfactions of the future is to increase their quantity. The majority of foreseeing persons are willing to pass by one hundred dollars worth of enjoyment now for the sake of one hundred and five dollars' worth one year hence. This advantage of quantity is made possible through the receipt of interest. It affects all those persons whose saving, as noted in the last article, involves a sacrifice which can be compensated only through interest, and in general all those persons who are compelled to choose between present and future luxuries. Were interest abolished these classes would cease to save for this kind of future goods.

According to Professor Taussig, "most saving is done by the well-to-do and the rich." ("Principles of Economics," II, 42). If this estimate is correct it seems to indicate that the suppression of interest would reduce the savings and capital of the community very considerably. For the greater part of the savings of the wealthy is derived not from salaries but from interest. Nevertheless, the abolition of interest would be followed by a much wider diffusion of wealth. The sums formerly paid in the form of interest would be distributed in

the form of increased wages and reduced cost of living for large masses of the population. This would mean that the latter would obtain an immensely greater capacity for saving. Out of their increased resources they might save as much as or even more than is now accumulated and invested by the well-to-do and the rich out of interest-incomes. (Cf. Hobson, "The Economics of Distribution," pp. 259-265).

To sum up the results of our inquiry into the subject of the necessity of interest: From the fact that men now receive interest we cannot infer that they would not save without interest. From the fact that many men would certainly save without interest we cannot infer that a sufficient amount would be saved to provide the community with the necessary supply of capital. Whether those classes which would possess the desire and the power to save more would increase their savings sufficiently to counteract the decrease on the part of those other classes whose desire and power would be lessened, is a question that admits of no definite or confident answer. Indeed, it cannot be answered even in terms of probability.

Nevertheless, this uncertainty does not preclude a definite answer to the main question of the social justification of interest. No matter what response be given to the former inquiry, the latter must be answered favorably and affirmatively. If the abolition of interest were followed by a considerable decline in saving and in the supply of capital, the community would be worse off than it is under the regime of interest. To diminish greatly the means of production, and consequently the supply of goods for the community's consumption, would cause far more hardship than it would relieve. While "workless" incomes would be suppressed, and the differences between the revenues of the various classes reduced, the total amount available for distribution would probably be so greatly diminished as to leave every class worse off than before. On the other hand, if we assume that interest could be suppressed without considering any reduction, or any material reduction, in the community's supply of capital, we are still constrained to think that any attempt at suppression would be contrary to the wel-

fare of society. Following are the considerations which compel this conclusion:

The civil authorities could not determine with any degree of precision what part of the gross returns of a business was pure interest, and what part was a necessary compensation for risk, enterprise, and the labor of management. Any attempt to distinguish between them would result in a mixture of futility and social injury. If the State should strive to meet the situation by allowing the directors of industry varying salaries to correspond with their various degrees of efficiency, and different rates of insurance—payments according to the different risks of the concerns, it would inevitably make some allowances so low as to discourage labor and enterprise, and others so high that the recipients would obtain a considerable amount of pure interest in the guise of profits and salaries. Should it fix a flat rate of salaries and profits the more efficient undertakers would refuse to put forth their best efforts, and the more perilous enterprises would be abandoned. Whichever plan were adopted, the practical difficulties would be insuperable. The supervision of expenses, receipts and other details of business in order to prevent evasion of the law, would cost probably more than the total amount now paid in the form of interest. When we add to all these difficulties the hardship to industry resulting from such a system of interference, we cannot but conclude that the attempt legally to abolish interest on producing capital would be socially unwise.

Such abolition might conceivably be effected through the suppression of interest on loans. Competition between interest-free loan capital and capital employed in production by its owners, would probably reduce the interest obtainable on the latter to insignificant proportions. However, this method of prohibition would prove only a little less futile than the other. Even in the Middle Ages, when the amount of money available for loans was comparatively small, and when the civil prohibition was powerfully re-inforced by the canons of the Church and by public opinion, the effort to suppress interest on loans was far from completely successful. Now that the supply of

money and the demand for loans in production have enormously increased, and interest is not definitely disapproved by either public opinion or the Church, a similar policy would probably be on the whole a failure.

Even if interest could, by any method whatever, be abolished, the results would be socially disastrous unless the prohibition were international in its scope. If it were enforced in only one or a few capitalistic countries these would suffer far more through the flight of capital than they would gain through the abolition of interest.

In view of the various and manifold uncertainties and difficulties of the situation, there is not a shadow of doubt that modern States are justified in permitting the institution of interest. The latter is clearly justified on grounds of social utility.

Nevertheless, this fact does not directly and necessarily justify the individual capitalist. It does not of itself prove that the capitalist has a moral right to take interest. Either through lack of prohibitions or failure adequately to enforce them, the civil law permits many actions which are morally wrong in the individual; for example, the payment of starvation wages, the extortion of unjust prices, and prostitution. Legal toleration does not *per se* nor always exonerate the individual offender. How, then, shall the individual interest-receiver be justified?

As already pointed out more than once, those persons who would not save without interest are justified on the ground of sacrifice. So long as the community desires these savings and is willing to pay interest on them, the savers may take it as the fair equivalent of the inconveniences that they undergo in performing this social service.

Those who do not need the inducement of interest, whose sacrifices of saving and conserving their capital are sufficiently compensated without interest, must be justified on indirect grounds and arguments of presumption. In the first place, it is clear that the civil law can make certain practices morally legitimate, and sometimes create moral rights and obligations. For example, the legal requirement that the individual must

repair property losses that he has caused his neighbor unintentionally, is binding *in conscience* as soon as the matter has been adjudicated by the court. In other words, this civil regulation confers on the injured man property rights, and on the inculpable injurer property obligations. Again, the legal provisions concerning prescription give moral validity to this title. When the alien possessor has complied with these provisions, he has a right to the property in question, even though the original owner may later on turn up and claim the property. Several other situations might be cited in which the State admittedly creates, or at least, occasions moral rights of individual ownership which would have no definite existence in the absence of such legal action and authorization.

This principle received its most pertinent application for our purpose in the doctrine of *praemium legale* as a title of interest on loans. In the "Opus Morale" of Ballerini-Palmieri will be found a long list of moral theologians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries who maintained that the mere legal authorization of a certain rate of interest justified the lender in exacting such interest. (Vol. 3, pp. 617-629; 2d Ed.). While they held to the traditional teaching that interest was not justifiable on intrinsic grounds, they maintained that for the sake of the public good the State could rightfully use its power of eminent domain to transfer from the borrower to the lender the money paid as interest on a loan. Of course, they did not mean that the State could arbitrarily take one man's property and hand it over to another. Their contention was that when the civil law sanctioned interest for reasons of public welfare, this extrinsic circumstance annulled the right of the borrower to retain the interest-payment, and transferred it to the lender. In other words, they held that the money paid in loan interest did not belong to either borrower or lender with certainty and definiteness, but that its ownership depended upon the presence or absence of extrinsic circumstances. The extrinsic circumstance of legal authorization for the common good determined that it should belong to the lender. More than one of these writers declared that the State had the same right to determine

this indeterminate property, to assign the title of ownership to the lender, as it had to assign and transfer ownership by the device of prescription. And their general contention seems to have been confirmed by the response of the Congregation of the Poenitentiaria, given February 11, 1832, (Op. cit., p. 627; cf. Van Roey, pp. 73-75) to the Bishop of Verona. The latter had inquired whether a confessor could be absolved who taught that the legal rate of interest could be taken on loans when no other title to interest was present. The answer was in the affirmative.

May not the same moral effect be attributed to the State's sanction of interest on producing capital? That part of the product of industry which is now appropriated as interest could be regarded as a sort of no man's property which the State has a right, for social reasons, to confer upon the capitalist, just as it assigns the "unearned increment," or increases in land values, to the landlord. Through the State's exercise of the power of eminent domain over this part of the product, the proprietor of a grocery business, the stockholder in a railroad, and every other producing capitalist, would obtain a moral right to interest on his capital.

Objection may, however, be taken to the parallel instituted in the last two paragraphs. The public good which is assumed to be involved in the transfer of interest-rights to the present-day capitalist who would continue to function as capitalist without interest, does not at all compare with the public benefit which in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries resulted from the policy of allowing interest on loans. The advocates of the doctrine sketched in the second last paragraph could point to the needs of rising national and international commerce and industry as sufficient reason for awarding interest to men who otherwise would have dissipated or hoarded their money, instead of lending it to the active directors of business. In other words, the public welfare in those days required not merely that the civil law should sanction interest on loans, but that it should confer upon the lender a moral right to interest. Conscientious men needed the assurance that they possessed such a right, in

order that they might have no hesitation in lending their money. Today the public good only requires that the State should refrain from attempting to suppress interest, not that capital owners should feel that they have a right to receive interest. For we are considering only those persons who would save and conserve their capital even if interest were abolished. The fact that many of them would try to get interest in spite of a legal prohibition is sufficient reason for civil toleration of the practice, but not sufficient reason for endowing them with a moral right to take advantage of the practice.

The objection has considerable force. Perhaps the most satisfactory way of dealing with it here is to recall the fact that we have nowhere contended that the intrinsic justification, or attempted justification, of interest on capital is *certainly* invalid. We have merely maintained that the usual intrinsic arguments brought forward on behalf of the capitalist's right to interest are not conclusive. Possibly these arguments have more value than their average proponent has yet shown, and possibly there are other and stronger arguments for the proposition. These possibilities combined with the civil sanction of interest, are sufficient to create a presumption that even those savers and capitalists who would continue as such without interest, are guilty of no injustice when they take interest. Until this presumption is overthrown by facts and arguments it will be adequate to exonerate and justify the individual capitalist. In one word, the interest-receiver must be accorded at least that measure of justification, that moral advantage, which in every doubtful situation accrues to the man who is in possession.

JOHN A. RYAN.

LABOUR EXCHANGES IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

For the last three decades of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth distress, due to want of employment and to under-employment, was prevalent in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. One result accruing from so deplorable a condition of affairs was the growing burden on the community at large of the local taxation necessary to provide under the Poor Law for the upkeep of men, women, and children who had become pauperized and thrown on the rates. This upkeep was either entire in the case of those who were inmates of workhouses,[1] or partial when it took the form of "outdoor relief," or doles of money, food, or clothing given to people in their homes. Another result was a noticeable physical deterioration of the race, shown, for example, in the difficulty experienced in finding men to come up to the moderate standard set for service in the army; shown, too, in the prevalence throughout the proletariate in many distressing forms of the countless ills which flesh is heir to.

Bad as these two results undoubtedly were, there was a third, which was perhaps worse than both combined. Concurrently with pauperism and physical deterioration there grew up a loosening of moral fibre, a listlessness, a shiftlessness, a want of thrift, and a mental degeneracy caused by a hopeless outlook on life, and terminating in the reduction of more and more people to the condition of being not only unemployed but even unemployable, and therefore showing a greater tendency and even a willingness to be dependent and to look to the Poor Law or to charity for the support of individuals and families.

At the same time trade, commerce, and industry, although of course subject to cyclical, seasonal, local, and extraordinary periods of depression, flourished as a whole. The annual in-

[1] Or poorhouses: the terms are practically interchangeable in the United Kingdom.

come of the United Kingdom was estimated to have increased from £814,000,000 in 1867 to £1,200,000,000 in 1875, to £1,350,000,000 in 1885, to £1,600,000,000 in 1891, and to £2,000,000,000 in 1903. Great wealth was amassed by individuals. Wages rose steadily in nearly every industrial group between 1886 and 1907. Capable and willing workers, skilled or unskilled, who were successful in finding employment, could usually hold it for the greater part of the year, while times were good; but, when times were bad, they were liable to be thrown idle in great numbers, and so still further swelled the already swollen ranks of the unemployed. Workers even of a high grade, who did not belong to a strong Trade Union capable of paying unemployment benefit for a protracted period, had thus but poor prospects. It was always difficult and often impossible for them during their periods of employment to make provision for their periods of enforced idleness. To make provision for compulsory retirement from work through invalidity or old age was scarcely to be thought of. When either of those dread alternatives occurred, these workers, in the absence of support from their children or connections, which from the very nature of the case was rarely forthcoming, had no prospect but the workhouse, or outdoor relief, or some form of charity from strangers. The case of inefficient workpeople and of the great class known as casual labourers was worse still.

It is clear therefore that a critical social condition had gradually arisen. It was a condition in which a *laissez faire* policy was of no avail. The old-time doctrine of the "economic man" had been blown to atoms. In its place there had been substituted for the last forty, and especially for the last twenty, years a well meant but wrongly conceived series of attempts at betterment of the workers' condition. It was found, however, by disastrous experience that palliatives, like the opening of labour yards in times of exceptional distress for the employment of men in stone-breaking, oakum-picking, or wood-chopping, resulting, in a recorded case, in the outlay of £7 to produce a ton of broken stones value for 12s.; like Municipal Relief Works, which in time came to be almost an annual in-

stitution; like special Charitable Funds, such as the Mansion House Funds of 1867, 1886, 1892-1895, and 1903-1904, the Press Funds of 1903-1904 and other years, the London Unemployed Fund of 1904-1905, and the Queen's Unemployed Fund of 1905-1906, some of which were described as "orgies of relief"; or like the Unemployed Workmen Act, 1905, with its Distress Committees and its limited number of Labour Bureaus or Exchanges, were entirely unequal to the situation. Of the last mentioned Act one of the deepest students of sociology and one of the acutest thinkers of our day has said:

> "Its main service has been to demonstrate beyond question its own essential inadequacy and the inadequacy of all measures which, like itself, leave industrial disorganisation untouched and deal only with the resultant human suffering." [2]

This opinion may be taken as fairly typical of the most advanced modern thought in the United Kingdom. Sociological experiments and legislation meant to be remedial had been going in the wrong direction. Further active intervention on the part of the state, but along totally different lines, seemed to be imperatively called for.

In order to justify such further state interference it was necessary to find out with as much exactitude as possible the true state of affairs, to locate the causes of unemployment and of under-employment, and then to suggest a remedy which might wholly or in great part cure the social ills from which the nation was suffering.

For this end the time-honoured method of inquiry by commission was adopted. This was, and indeed still is, a convenient way of shelving indefinitely some troublesome subject; but the urgency of the present case precluded the possibility of any such result. Accordingly, on December 4, 1905, King Edward VII. by Royal Warrant constituted fifteen men and three women into a commission to inquire

(1). Into the working of the laws relating to the relief of poor persons in the United Kingdom;

(2). Into the various means which have been adopted out-

[2] W. H. Beveridge, *Unemployment, a Problem of Industry*, p. 191.

side of the Poor Laws for meeting distress arising from want of employment, particularly during periods of severe industrial depression.

These Commissioners were authorized to summon witnesses, to call for information in writing, to have access to and to examine all books, documents, registers, and records that could give them the fullest information, to visit and personally inspect such places as they might deem expedient, and to carry on their investigations by all other lawful ways and means. They were enjoined to report, with as little delay as possible, the result of their inquiries, to express their opinion on the matters submitted for their consideration, and in particular to say whether any, and, if so, what, modification of the Poor Laws or changes in their administration or fresh legislation for dealing with distress were in their judgment advisable.

The Commission sat for over three years, and conducted a most thorough and painstaking investigation, covering a very wide economic and sociological range. In fact, the work they performed might properly be described as one of the biggest undertakings of its kind of modern times. When they came to report, however, sharp divisions of opinion were revealed, and accordingly two separate reports—the Majority Report and the Minority Report—were sent in. The Majority Report, signed by fourteen of the Commissioners, is contained in two closely printed large octavo volumes, the first of 565 and the second of 343 pages, and the Minority Report, signed by the other four Commissioners, is contained in one similar volume of 716 pages.

While these two sections of the Commission were hopelessly and irreconcilably at variance on many, if not most, of the important subjects with which they were called upon to deal, they were of one mind in recommending the adoption of a national system of Labour Exchanges as the first step towards the relief of distress due to want of employment.

The Majority Report, Vol. II, p. 231, says:—

"In the forefront of our proposals we place labour exchanges";

and again, Vol. II, p. 265:—

"A national system of Labour Exchanges should be established and worked by the Board of Trade for the general purposes of assisting the mobility of labour and of collecting accurate information as to unemployment."

The Minority Report, p. 637, is equally emphatic:—

"The first requisite is the organisation throughout the whole of the United Kingdom of a complete system of public Labour Exchanges on a national basis. This National Labour Exchange, though in itself no adequate remedy, is the foundation of all our proposals. It is, in our view, an indispensable condition of any real reform."

These reports were presented on February 4, 1909, and the Government with considerable promptitude proceeded to give effect to the recommendations as to Labour Exchanges on which both reports were in substantial agreement. Already in advance of the actual date borne by the reports their recommendations were known to the Board of Trade, and on January 21, 1909, a Departmental Committee was set to work to consider and report on the organisation and finance of a system of Labour Exchanges. This Committee sent in its report on March 27, 1909, and following the lines laid down therein a Bill "to provide for the establishment of Labour Exchanges and for other purposes incidental thereto" was introduced into Parliament by the then President of the Board of Trade on behalf of the Government on May 20, 1909. Accompanied by an outline of the system proposed to be followed by the Board of Trade and by an estimate of the cost, the Bill was received favorably by leading members of all political parties, and, meeting with little or no opposition, it became law on September 20, as the Labour Exchanges Act, 1909, [9 Edw. VII, Ch. 7.]

This Act is the foundation of that system of Labour Exchanges in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with the working of which this present paper is directly concerned.

A reference to the Act will show that it is limited to a very few clauses, and that it is mainly permissive in character:

"The Board of Trade may establish and maintain, in such places

as they think fit, labour exchanges, and may assist any labour exchanges maintained by any other authorities or persons, and in the exercise of those powers may, if they think fit, co-operate with any other authorities or persons having powers for the purpose.

"The Board of Trade may also, by such other means as they think fit, collect and furnish information as to employers requiring workpeople and workpeople seeking engagement or employment.

. . . . . .

"The Board of Trade may appoint such officers and servants for the purposes of this Act as the Board may, with the sanction of the Treasury, determine, and there shall be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament to such officers and servants such salaries or remuneration as the Treasury may determine, and any expenses incurred by the Board of Trade in carrying this Act into effect, including the payment of travelling and other allowances to members of advisory committees and other expenses in connexion therewith, to such amount as may be sanctioned by the Treasury, shall be defrayed out of moneys provided by Parliament."

That is to say, in plain English, power is given to the Board of Trade to expend money from the national exchequer on the establishment and upkeep of Labour Exchanges.

The Board of Trade was not slow to take advantage of this parliamentary authorization. There was an enormous amount of preliminary details to be seen to, such as the carrying on of needed propaganda work, the drafting of regulations, the preparation of forms, the securing of premises and fitting them up into suitable offices, and the selection of a staff of competent officers.

In connection with the first and second items there was prepared a "Labour Exchanges General Memorandum" of 22 folio pages of print, and also a paper of "General Regulations." The latter was drawn up after consultation with representative associations of employers and workmen. The former is a "Confidential" document, and therefore, although a copy of it was furnished to me, I am debarred from alluding more particularly to it; nor, indeed, is it important that I should do so.

The question of forms was so important that a Departmental Committee was appointed on October 30, 1909, to deal with it. This committee went thoroughly into the matter, having before

it the Act itself, all the official Labour Exchange literature of the Board of Trade, various Confidential Reports, and the forms in use in many German Labour Exchanges, in the Metropolitan Employment Exchanges, and in the Labour Exchanges existing in certain provincial towns in Great Britain. In December, 1909, the Committee made its report, which, covering 31 folio pages, is a model of accuracy, fullness, and foresight.

The questions of premises and of staff were similarly dealt with, that is, by the appointment of special committees to investigate and report. In connection with the recruiting of the staff this is the proper place to note that the usual practice in the United Kingdom, of having officials appointed as the result of a Civil Service examination, was in this case departed from, because of the unprecedented character of the work to be done, and of the necessity for securing the best available ability at the outset of a new enterprise, which was in essence of a highly experimental character. All appointments therefore were made from headquarters and ratified by the Board of Trade. From some considerable experience of all ranks of Labour Exchange officials I am in a position to state that, generally speaking, they appear to have been extremely well chosen in view of the duties to be performed.

The preliminaries being as far as possible arranged, the Labour Exchanges were opened for work on February 1, 1910. By the end of that month there were 83 Labour Exchanges in operation and they have since been gradually increased. The total number originally projected was 254, to be worked from the eleven Divisional Centres of London, Bristol, Nottingham, Birmingham, Cardiff, Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds and Sheffield, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Glasgow, and Dublin; but because of the necessity of taking in smaller towns and rural districts, and because the exchanges had also to be used in connection with the later-devised scheme of insurance against unemployment, that limit had to be considerably passed. During 1910, 146 exchanges were established; during 1911, 115; during

1912, 153; and during 1913, 11, bringing the total up to 425. By August 15, 1913, the number had still further gone up to 427, but by February 13, 1914, it had fallen to 423.

The Central Office, which is a branch of the Labour Department of the Board of Trade, is situated in London. It does not deal directly with either employers or workpeople, except in certain cases of emigration, but serves simply for organization, control, and statistics.

Under this Central Office the whole country is mapped out into eleven divisions, having their centres as above, each under the charge of a Divisional Officer, who has complete authority over, and full responsibility for, all the Exchanges in his Division, and through whom all orders and communications concerning them pass. Each division is a unit both for purposes of control and for the purposes of what has been called "clearing house" work, that is, the transference of work people who are unemployed in one place to meet an unsatisfied demand for labour in another.

In each division there are Exchanges of different grades according to the number, population, and importance of the cities and towns to be served. There are, so far, five grades of Exchanges, viz:—

1. Class A. Exchanges: For Towns over 100,000 population.
2. Class B. Exchanges: For Towns 50,000 to 100,000 population.
3. Class C. Exchanges: For Towns 25,000 to 50,000 population.
4. Sub-Offices: For suburban districts and small towns near larger ones.
5. Waiting Rooms: For special trades and districts, *e. g.*, near docks, etc.

The grade of the Exchange regulates approximately both the staff allowed and the extent and variety of the accommodation for workpeople. In an Exchange of Class A., for instance, the normal staff consists of a manager, four registration clerks,

and a clerk messenger, while a sub-office has only an assistant manager (who works under the supervision of the manager of a neighbouring important exchange), a clerk, and a messenger, and a waiting room has only a single officer. In the larger Exchanges provision is made for dealing separately with skilled workmen, general labourers, skilled women, unskilled women, boys, and girls, whereas in the smallest exchanges there are at most but two separate departments, for men and women, respectively.

The Exchanges are housed for the present in temporary premises such as could be readily found available and adapted to the purpose at short notice. It is intended later to build permanent premises for at least the Class A. Exchanges. A personal inspection of a very large proportion of the Exchanges enables me to say that the adaptation has, as a rule, been well carried out, with due attention to ventilation, lighting, heating, and sanitary conveniences. A special feature is an adequate installation of telephones both for local service and long distance calls.

To illustrate the methods of operation used by the Exchanges, I cannot do better than quote from a paper on the subject read to the *Conférence Internationale du Chômage* at Paris in September, 1910, by the Director of the Labour Exchanges. He says:

"Workpeople are as a rule registered by a clerk who takes down their answers to questions put in accordance with a prescribed form of application, but they may if they prefer it (as is sometimes the case with the more skilled men and clerks) fill in a form themselves and hand it to the clerk. In the former case the answers are entered directly on to an index card which then forms the workman's record in the Exchange; in the latter case the answers filled in by the workman have subsequently to be transferred to an index card. Workpeople are not under any obligation to answer all the questions on the form, and on the other hand they may volunteer additional information. Workpeople residing within three miles of an Exchange are required to register in person; others may make application by post. Applicants under 17 years of

age have a different form, the forms for men, women, boys, and girls all having distinctive colours. On registration each applicant is given a Registration Card. This card he must, so long as he wishes to remain on the register, bring with him every week to the Exchange to be stamped, while if he obtains work through his own efforts he is required to return the card at once to the Exchange through the post with a statement to this effect. When the Registration Card is given out it is marked with the day of the week, and the workman is asked to come again on that same day each following week. The card is addressed on the back to the Labour Exchange and is franked for free transmission through the post. Applications for workpeople are as a rule received by telephone, though naturally in some cases employers write or send a messenger or come themselves. When an application has been received from an employer and a suitable workman found by the Exchange—either from among those in the waiting room or by summoning one from his home—the workman is sent to the employer with an Identification Card, which the latter is requested to sign and return with a statement as to whether the man has been engaged or not. This card also is now franked for free transmission through the post.

The index cards of the workpeople who have registered or renewed their registration within the past week and have not since then obtained employment form the "Live Register" of the Exchange and it is to these primarily that the Exchange looks for the filling of any vacancies that may be notified by employers, these cards being arranged by occupations. It is, moreover, this Live Register that is used for the purpose of statistics. The Cards of those who fail to renew their applications on the right day are generally left for a week or a fortnight in an "Intermediate Register," while there is a "Dead Register" of all those who have obtained employment or have not presented themselves at the Exchange for some weeks. Should one of these men on the Dead Register appear at the Exchange later, his old index card will be used again, but he will count as a fresh registration."

To these details it may be added that the telegraph system, in addition to the other methods specified above, is sometimes used by employers seeking workpeople in a hurry; that where possible there are separate entrances to the Exchange for employers, for workmen, for work women, for boys, and for girls; and that in the larger exchanges there are women clerks to deal with women applicants for employment, with girls, and, often, with boys.

The main characteristics of this Labour Exchange system are summed up by saying that it is national, industrial, free, voluntary, and impartial.

It is national, first, because it covers the whole of the United Kingdom and each Exchange co-operates with every other Exchange to supply workpeople to employers who require them and to find work for workpeople who seek it; and, secondly, because it is administered by a department of the central government through officers appointed and paid by that department.

It is industrial as distinct from eleemosynary. It was made clear to all and sundry from the outset that the Labour Exchanges were in no way associated either with the administration of the Poor Law, or with any form of charity. It was meant to be, and is administered as, a part of the industrial organization of the country. No stigma attaches to the use of it either by employer or employee any more than there does to the use of the post office, the high road, or any other public utility. The questions asked of workpeople have reference to nothing but their qualifications for the employment sought: no question as to their means, the number of their family, their personal habits, their thrift, or anything similar, is ever asked. The Labour Exchange is not for the person who wants relief but is unable or unwilling to work. Employment and information are the only commodities it deals in, and it deals in all kinds of employment, skilled and unskilled, with the one exception of indoor domestic servants.

It is free, because no fees of any kind are asked or expected either from employers or from applicants for employment.

It is voluntary, because no compulsion is or can be exercised upon either employers or applicants for employment to use the Labour Exchanges against their will. The success or failure of the system depends solely on its efficiency or want of efficiency. That of course is not to say that its officials are prevented from taking every legitimate means to prove alike to employers and to those needing employment that it will be to their best interest to use the Labour Exchanges. As a matter of fact, the officials are energetic canvassers among both classes of their patrons, and I think that much of the success that has hitherto attended the working of the Exchanges is due to the forcible reasoning to that effect used on public platforms and in personal interviews by the higher officials.

It is meant to be, and I think may safely be said to be, strictly impartial as between employers and workpeople. Any rare instances of prejudice against, or partiality towards, either side on the part of any official has been visited with condign punishment, either dismissal or reduction of grade. In a system dependent upon the voluntary support of employers and workpeople it would be suicidal to be otherwise than impartial between both when their interests are in real or apparent conflict. In different parts of Germany four principles have been followed by Labour Exchanges in reference to trade disputes:

1. To ignore such disputes altogether, that is, to send workmen to a vacancy created by a dispute in exactly the same way as to any other vacancy and without special warning;

2. To register vacancies created by a dispute and to notify them to applicants for work by giving formal notice of the dispute to each applicant for employment individually or by placards posted in the Exchange premises, thus placing the decision as to seeking or not seeking the vacancy on the applicant;

3. To suspend operations within the range of the dispute during its continuance;

4. To make action in each particular case depend upon the decision of an Arbitration Court.

The second of these methods is the one most favored in Germany, and it also is the one that has been adopted in the Labour

Exchanges of the United Kingdom. In accordance with Clause III of the General Regulations any association of employers or workmen may file at a Labour Exchange a statement with regard to the existence of a strike or a lock-out affecting their trade in the district. Such statement shall be in a specified form, and shall be signed by a duly authorized person. This statement must be made known to any applicant for employment to whom there is notified a vacancy with an employer affected by the dispute. Otherwise, the statement is treated as confidential; it is not shown to workmen generally: in fact, it is not shown at all unless and until a vacancy is notified by the employer affected. Further, if an employer affected by the statement notifies to a Labour Exchange a vacancy, he must be told of the statement and given an opportunity of making a written counter-statement, and this counter-statement must be shown along with the original statement to the applicant for work. On the applicant is thrown the onus of deciding what action he will take. So far as the Labour Exchange is concerned, he is a perfectly free agent to accept or decline the employment. Another safeguard is that the original statement is valid for seven days and no more, unless formally renewed, in which case it remains in force for another period of seven days, and so on. Similarly with regard to wages and conditions of employment the Exchanges are required by the General Regulations (Clause IV) to take the standpoint of absolute non-interference. The responsibility of fixing terms rests entirely on employers and workpeople individually or collectively. In this matter the Exchange limits itself to supplying information. It is further provided that

"Copies or summaries of any agreements mutually arranged between associations of employers and workmen for the regulation of wages or other conditions of labour in any trade may, with the consent of the various parties to such agreements, be filed at a labour exchange, and any published rules made by public authorities with regard to like matters may also be filed. Documents so filed shall be open to inspection on application";

and that

"No person shall suffer any disqualification or be otherwise prejudiced on account of refusing to accept employment found for him

through a Labour Exchange where the ground of refusal is that a trade dispute which affects his trade exists or that the wages offered are lower than those current in the trade in the district where the employment is found."

The only occasion on which an apparently different principle is adopted is when there is question of advancing railroad fare to enable a workman to go to a place where employment awaits him. The General Regulations (Clause V, Section 3) provide that no such advance shall be made where the Labour Exchange official has reason to believe that the vacancy in question is due to a trade dispute or that employment is offered at a rate of wages lower than the rate current in that trade in that district. It is evident, however, on examination, that this provision is really meant to maintain the non-interference policy of the Labour Exchange by keeping it free from even the semblance of providing "blackleg" or "scab" labour.

A final guarantee of impartiality has been provided by the appointment of Advisory Trade Committees to advise and assist the Board of Trade in regard to any matters referred to them in connection with the management of Labour Exchanges. It is provided by the General Regulations (Clause VII, Section 1) that

"There shall be established by the Board of Trade in such areas of the United Kingdom as they think fit advisory trade committees consisting of equal numbers of persons representing employers and workmen in the district and appointed by the Board of Trade after consultation with such bodies and persons as they may think best qualified to advise them on the matter, together with a chairman, agreed upon by a majority both of the persons representing employers and of the persons representing workmen, or in default of such agreement appointed by the Board of Trade."

It is intended that these Advisory Committees shall deal with large areas and not with single Exchanges. It seems as if from their constitution they may be relied on to see that impartiality on the part of Labour Exchange officials as between employers and workpeople shall be strictly observed.

As was to be expected in a country in which unemployment and under-employment on a large scale had been chronic for

a long period, there was a great rush of workpeople to the Labour Exchanges in the beginning. Despite all that had been said in advance as to the purely industrial and non-charitable nature of the new organization, there was a widespread popular delusion that the Labour Exchanges were to be a panacea for industrial ills, a sure means of finding employment for everyone who needed it. The result was that all sorts of people, of whom a large percentage was wholly unemployable, made application to the Exchanges for positions. Thus in February, 1910, while only 21,193 vacancies were notified to the Exchanges, the wholly disproportionate number of 216,813 applications was received from workpeople during that month. Soon, however, it began to be realized that qualifications for the work sought were as necessary in dealing with the Labour Exchange as they would be in dealing directly with an employer. Thereupon there ensued a sudden decrease in the number of applications for employment. Thus, while out of the 21,193 vacancies mentioned above, 12,628 were filled, the number of applications for employment remaining on the registers at the end of the month of February had fallen from 216,813 to 112,424; and while for the first four months both the vacancies notified and the vacancies filled were as a rule on the increase, applicants for employment kept dropping away. This decrease is of course partly accounted for by a general improvement in trade during the period under notice, and partly by the fact that, the vacancies notified not being nearly commensurate with the numbers of those who sought them, many desirable applicants were therefore driven back on the old channels of employment, such as Trade Unions or other agencies; but it is mainly to be attributed to the conviction gradually forced on unemployable and undesirable applicants that the Labour Exchange was no place for them.

In dealing with the latter class of applicants the officials show great tact, discretion, and common sense. They make it their business to find out, by personal interview and outside inquiries, all they can concerning each applicant, and, while they register and re-register every one who comes forward, they are careful, for the sake of the credit of the Exchange as

an employment agency, not to recommend any unsuitable person for any vacancy. Mistakes in this matter were doubtless inevitable at first, and were sometimes made; but, experience teaching, they were never repeated in the case of the same individual. The result was that unemployables and undesirables, seeing that they gained nothing by the Exchange and were merely wasting their time in going there day after day and week after week, dropped gradually away, and eventually ceased almost altogether to register.

So thorough a revolution in the method of bringing the worker and the job together was bound at the outset to be received with a certain amount of scepticism both by capital and labour. For various reasons, among which were the natural inclination to cling to old methods and a certain amount of political prejudice on the part of conservatives against a measure that had emanated from the liberals, employers displayed at first a good deal of hesitation and delay in notifying vacancies; but they have gradually learned the value of the Exchanges to themselves and for that reason are generally co-operating with them. Some of them are disposed to adopt the Exchanges as their regular method of obtaining labour, and have placed notices on their factory or warehouse gates stating that applicants for employment should register at the local Exchange. One is liable to look upon the Labour Exchange system in its bearings on workpeople only, but it must be borne in mind that it is eminently two-sided, being a convenience to employers as well as a help to workers. Formerly a good workman, coming to a factory when he was not wanted, passed on and disappeared. Now, if he follows the instruction directing him to the Exchange and registers there, a permanent record is made of him, and his services may be obtained when required. The growth of the vacancies notified appears to afford evidence that the employers are more and more inclined to avail themselves of the services of the Exchanges. The number of such vacancies was 458,942 in 1910; 788,609 in 1911; 1,062,574 in 1912; and 1,222,828 in 1913.

Unorganized labour naturally had recourse to the Exchanges from the beginning: the case with organized labour ran a very

peculiar course. It is important to note it, because, although the 2,000,000 trade unionists in the United Kingdom are much less than a quarter of the individual manual workers, the position occupied and the power wielded in public life in Great Britain and Ireland by organized labour are very great. Before the introduction of the Labour Exchanges Bill a national conference of trade union delegates convened by the parliamentary committee of the Trade Union Congress resolved unanimously:

"That this conference of trade union delegates representing 1,400,000 trade unionists approves of the establishment of Labour Exchanges on a national basis under the control of the Board of Trade, provided that the managing board contains an equal proportion of employers and representatives of trade unions."

The proviso in that resolution has been to some extent met by the appointment of the Advisory Committees. A further concession to Trade Union sentiment was made by the nomination of men who had been prominent in Trade Union ranks to various posts, both principal and subordinate, in the Exchanges. Whether or not this move had the desired effect is open to question, for, under the strict requirements as to impartiality contained in the Act and the General Regulations, the ex-Trade Union leader as a rule quickly developed into a non-committal Government official, and thereby in some cases earned a good deal of opprobrium from his former fellows.

Since the Act went into operation the attitude of Trade Unions has developed from conditional friendliness through interested watchfulness to criticism and more or less open hostility on certain points and finally to reserved acquiescence. At first a fair number of Trade Unions or branches of Trade Unions instructed all their unemployed members to register regularly at the Exchanges, and some of them had it in contemplation to make such registration and the production of a registration card a condition of receipt of unemployment benefit. Still there were occasional complaints and grumblings. Finally at the Trade Union Congress held at Sheffield in September, 1910, a resolution was passed, by 1,147,000 against 272,000, condemning the Exchanges as thitherto managed; demanding that recognized Trade Union

officials be supplied with the name and address of, and the wages paid by, any firm offering employment through an Exchange; that applicants for situations be not sent outside their own districts unless the firm offering employment recognized Trade Union rates; and that applications from firms having disputes with their workpeople be not entertained by the Exchanges after a dispute had been officially notified by the Trade Union concerned. A hitch which might have had important consequences thus arose; but with the British spirit of compromise at work and the great scheme for insurance against sickness and unemployment following hard upon the heels of the Labour Exchanges Act, a *modus vivendi* was reached and the Exchanges continued to carry on their operations more or less along the lines originally laid down.

With regard to juvenile employment through the Labour Exchanges there was some danger of a conflict between the education authorities and the Board of Trade, but the difficulty has been overcome. Two points in particular have to be seen to in connection with juvenile employment. The first is that boys and girls should be allowed to complete their ordinary school education before going to work, and that after they have gone to work they should be given the opportunity of still further improving themselves by attending night schools or continuation classes. This matter has received and is receiving earnest attention. The second point is that juveniles should, when possible, be prevented from taking up "blind alley" occupations, that is, work that leads nowhither and leaves them stranded, when they have attained to manhood or womanhood, without training or aptitude for a trade or a definite pursuit. This is a complex and a difficult problem, and time alone can show whether, and if so, how the Labour Exchanges can solve it. One way of dealing with it is the use of separate Advisory Committees for Juvenile Employment, from which much resultant good has accrued and still more is expected. To aid the Labour Exchanges and the Local Education Authorities in this matter parliament passed in 1910 the Education (Choice of Employment) Act, which has since been energetically worked and has been found to be of material help.

Allusion has been already made more than once to the advancing of railroad fare to workers to enable them to take up positions at a distance. This is a distinguishing and important feature of the Act, and one that, when fully working, will afford a splendid test of the mobility of labour.[3] These advances are not by way of gift but by way of loan. Naturally they are surrounded by many safe-guards. No advance is made unless to a person going to take up a position secured beforehand through a Labour Exchange. Advances are not made for distances under five miles. The amount of the advance to each individual must not exceed the actual cheapest railroad fare for one person one way between the two points. Thus no allowance is made for the conveyance of wife, husband, children, or dependents, nor is there any allowance for subsistence on the way. As already pointed out, a travelling advance cannot be made when the manager of the Exchange has reason to believe that the employment offered is due to a trade dispute or that the scale of pay arranged is lower than that current in that trade or district. Generally the advance takes the form of a voucher which on presentation to a booking-clerk entitles the holder to receive a railroad ticket. The voucher is afterwards sent to the Labour Exchange, which pays to the railroad company the amount of the fare. It is only in very exceptional cases that the advance to the work person is made in cash. The Exchange arranges beforehand whether it is the employer or the employee that is to refund the amount of the loan. Sometimes it is the employer: occasionally indeed the employer agrees to pay the fare out of his own pocket in order to secure the operative. Generally, however, it is the employee that is responsible for the repayment, and in that case the employer agrees to deduct a fixed instalment from the weekly wages and to forward it to the Exchange until the whole amount

[3] By this expression there is here meant, of course, "place mobility," that is, the ability and readiness to move from one centre of industry to another according to the state of the labour market. I have failed to find in the working of the Labour Exchanges anything that would tend to show "trade mobility," that is, mobility between different trades or different branches of the same trade. This latter form of mobility, or fluidity, as it is also called, is greatly discouraged by Trade Unions in the United Kingdom.

is paid off. It is not to be expected but that some bad debts will be made by the Labour Exchanges in connection with this system; but the advances are generally repaid. From February, 1910, to September 30, 1913, the number of cases in which fares for transportation were thus advanced was about 34,000, and the total amount involved was approximately £10,400.

Another point that seems to deserve attention is that fradulent misrepresentation is carefully guarded against. Section 3 of the Act provides that if any person knowingly makes any false statement or false representation to a Labour Exchange official for the purpose of obtaining employment or procuring work people, that person shall be liable in respect of each such offence on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding £10.

The table on p. 372 illustrates in a convenient form some of the foregoing statements and in addition gives a good general idea of the working of the Labour Exchanges.

The estimate for the outlay on the Labour Exchanges was £210,000 for 1910-11; £210,000 for 1911-12; £804,539 for 1912-13; and £984,525 for 1913-14.

The Labour Exchange system, big as it was in conception, was meant to be only a part of a gigantic scheme for dealing with distress. For some years past provision for unemployment due to accidents to workpeople had been made by the Employers' Liability Act of 1880 and the Workmen's Compensation Act [4] of 1897, and a further extension was given to the principle of providing in an honorable way for the unemployed or under-em-

[4] Under the Workmen's Compensation Act, when death results from an injury incident to the employment, if a workman leaves any one who was wholly dependent on his earnings, there is payable a sum equal to his earnings in the employment of the same employer during the three years next preceding the injury, or the sum of £150, whichever of those sums is the larger, but not exceeding £350 in any case. If he leaves no such dependants, but only those who are partly dependent on him, a sum less than that which would have been payable as above is agreed or determined upon. When, not death, but total or partial incapacity for work results from the injury, a weekly payment during the incapacity, not exceeding 50 per cent. of his average weekly earnings during the previous twelve months, is payable. It can readily be seen that this Act might hit the small employer hard. Employers generally evade the responsibility by insurance, but the premiums are a tax in themselves.

REGISTRATIONS, INDIVIDUALS REGISTERED, AND VACANCIES, 1911, 1912, 1913.

		Number of Registrations.	Number of Individuals Registered.	Number of Vacancies (Situations) Notified.	Number of Vacancies (Situations) Filled.	Number of Individuals Given Work.
Men.....	1911	1,323,162	978,211	446,035	362,670	268,794
	1912	1,594,236	1,025,332	626,756	513,649	336,341
	1913	2,038,735	1,267,077	714,270	566,150	390,141
Women.	1911	414,459	307,641	178,446	136,409	97,598
	1912	518,775	360,873	226,276	168,555	118,650
	1913	532,060	351,755	270,325	199,395	133,424
Boys....	1911	185,108	138,684	106,290	77,881	64,752
	1912	200,403	146,434	130,601	88,086	70,565
	1913	186,574	137,668	143,715	90,387	74,535
Girls. ..	1911	117,718	88,833	57,208	44,450	38,066
	1912	151,890	110,948	78,941	57,940	48,153
	1913	158,524	115,171	94,518	65,921	54,206
Total....	1911	2,040,447	1,513,369	788,609	621,410	469,210
	1912	2,465,304	1,643,587	1,062,574	828,230	573,709
	1913	2,965,893	1,871,671	1,222,828	921,853	652,306
Percentage increases :—						
1913 over 1912		20.3	13.9	15.1	11.3	13.7
1913 over 1911		45.4	23.7	55.1	48.3	39.0

ployed poor by the Old Age Pensions Act of 1908, which came into operation on January 1, 1909. By this Act a pension not exceeding as a maximum 5s a week is payable to every needy person of good character in the United Kingdom who is over 70 years of age. According to the means of the recipient the pension may go down to 4s, 3s, 2s, or 1s a week, the idea being that those who have other means may by the pension have a total income of 13s a week. These apparently small allowances have been a great boon to thousands of the aged and deserving poor. In comparing values it must be remembered that the purchasing power of 5s. is very much greater in the United Kingdom than the purchasing power of a corresponding amount in the United

States. The result of the working of the Act has been materially to decrease the number of paupers, that is, of those who are relieved by the Poor Law. The total number of paupers in receipt of relief in England and Wales on June 25, 1910, was 762,111 as against 784,434 on June 26, 1909, showing a decrease in the rate of pauperism to population from 22.2 per 1,000 to 21.3 within the twelve months. The extent of this system may be fairly judged from the outlay required. The estimate for 1908-9 was £2,110,000; for 1909-10, £8,750,000; for 1910-11, £9,720,000; for 1911-12, £12,415,000; for 1912-13, £12,200,000; and for 1913-14, £12,600,000.

But, even with those four Acts in operation, the whole field of unemployment was not covered. Accidents are not the only checks to wage-earning during active life, and experience has shown that wage-earning itself generally ceases before the pension age of seventy. Something more was felt to be required in the United Kingdom, if all the exigencies of unemployment were to be met. The next great forward step was the establishment of a system of compulsory national insurance against loss of income through sickness or unemployment, by the passing of the National Insurance Act in 1911. This Act became operative in July, 1912. It may justly be described as one of the most revolutionary and far-reaching enactments ever placed on a statute-book.[5] The estimates for the outlay of the state on this scheme, exclusive of the contributions of employers and employed and other insurers, were £2,040,423 for 1912-13 and £6,514,098 for 1913-14.

The Old Age Pension Act may be regarded as a preparation for, and the National Insurance Act as a most important supplement of, the Labour Exchanges Act. All three taken together form the great charter given to the poor and to workers by the Liberal party since its advent to power on December 5, 1905.

P. J. Lennox.

Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[5] I have given a fairly detailed explanation of the National Insurance Act, under the title "Insuring a Nation," in *The North American Review* of January, 1912.

CHATEAUBRIAND AND THE AMERICAN INDIAN.

To all of us, the name of the French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau is familiar, as standing for a "Return to Nature." Now a Return to Nature naturally and necessarily meant the abolition of all conventions and institutions, but it also meant a return to a simple communal state and a faith in the worth of man, in his ability to apprehend truth emotionally. It is the combination of these two ideas that gives Rousseau his double worth. As an assailant of the institutions which corrupt men, especially of government, and as an advocate of the worth of the individual, he was a Revolutionist. "His writings were the Jacobin creed. Robespierre and Saint-Just were his apostles. The Terror was his millenium." As an advocate of the emotional and sentimental, he was forerunner of the reactionary romanticists of France. In his second Discourse on Inequality he had exalted Indian life as something "intermediate between the indolence of the primitive state and the petulant activity of self-love now seen in the world." He had exploited the Indians as Voltaire had exploited the Chinese,—with little comprehension of their true condition. He had emphasized the fact that Indian tribes were governed by an intellectual aristocracy and had loudly proclaimed the freedom of the savage.

Then, when France was disillusioned with liberty, in the midst of reaction, Chateaubriand, Saint-Pierre, and Madame du Staël turned back to the sentimentalism of Rousseau which had been so popular in the France of Louis XVI. The romantic spirit in France thus emphasized emotion rather than thought. For example, in the field of religion, natural revulsion from Danton's Goddess of Reason on the Altar of Notre-Dame turned emotionally from the unbridled "reign of reason" to strong legitimate authority, to the Faith of the Catholic Church. Chateaubriand said: "I explain the Gospel, not in the interest of despotism, but as a comfort for the sorrowing";

and Lamennais marked the furthest reaction from irreverent rationalism when he declared: "All truths indispensable to mankind have been revealed by God, preserved by tradition, and safeguarded by authority . . . developed into Christianity, set before us in the Catholic Church, and embodied in her head."[1]

In 1802, on the eve of Napoleon's reconciliation with the Church and signing of the Concordat, Chateaubriand issued the *Génie du Christianisme,* the book which places him historically as chief representative of the reaction and "the most conspicuous figure in French Literature during the First Empire." [2] This volume, an inspired eulogy rather than a reasonable study,[3] attained great popularity [4] and wide influence.[5] One writer said: "He reinstated religion in the world." [6]

Chateaubriand was a very prominent political figure in France during the years immediately following the overthrow of Napoleon until the revolution of 1830.[7] He himself tells [8] how in the American wilderness he read in a paper of the Flight to Varennes and the capture of the King. "The journal also told of the progress of the *émigration* and the reunion

[1] *Cambridge Modern History,* x, 5.

[2] 11 ed. *Encyclopedia Britannica.* The *Catholic Encyclopedia* gives higher praise and says, "The whole literary movement characteristic of the nineteenth century begins with him. Admitting that he had predecessors and that his style is reminiscent of J.-J. Rousseau, he undoubtedly inaugurated a new literature."

[3] Etienne Pierre de Sénancour, *Observations critiques sur l'ouvrage intitulé Genie du Christianisme,* etc. Paris, 1816: "le style est remarquable . . . ne peut être lu sans impatience par quiconque veut écouter la raison, et désire connaître le vrai."

[4] 105 ed. are listed in *Catalogue Général des livres imprimés de la bibliotheque national.* tome 27.

[5] Vide: Beranek, *Chateaubriand über die Englander und Franzosen,* Bielitz, 1885; Buhling, *Le Genie d. dans l'hist. d. l. littér. française,* Halberstadt, 1894; W. S. Lilly, *Notes on Chateaubriand,* 19th century, 69: 651.

[6] The Abbé Pradt, quoted in the *Catholic Encyclopedia.*

[7] Vide: Albert Cassagne, *La vie politique de François de Chateaubriand,* Paris, 1911, who renders high praise to him as one of the greatest statesmen of France.

[8] *Voyage en Amerique,* ed. Paris, 1828, 2: 157-158.

of almost all the officers of the French Army under the flag of the French Prince. I thought I heard the voice of honour and I gave up my plans," [9] says Chateaubriand. From the time when the conservative majority of 1816 defeated the Duc de Richelieu, Chateaubriand remained high in favour with Louis XVIII and with Charles X. Reverting from chaotic rational iconoclasm, he studied an idealised past [10] and held to the doctrine of complete and lasting union between the altar and the throne. He professed to believe in the principles of the French Revolution but to "dislike the violences which dishonoured it" [11] and which has needlessly assailed venerable institutions. He stood for reaction.[12] He represented France at the Congress of Verona, where the stalwart conservatives Castlereagh, Wellington and Metternich represented England and Austria.[13] Later, as time went on, he fell out with Charles X; and in 1831, in a paper entitled "*Concerning the Restoration and the Elective Monarchy,*" he declared: "I am a Bourbon as a matter of honour, royalist according to reason and conviction, and republican by taste and character." He seems to have believed in a constitutional monarchy [14]—an attitude that was "republican" in 1831.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] Vide: *Les Martyrs*, Paris and Lyons, 1810 and other ed. *Analyse de l'histoire de France*, Paris, 1850. *Considerations sur le génie des hommes, des temps, et des revolutions*, Paris, 1849. *Discours servants d'introduction à l'histoire de France, lu dans la séance tenue par l'Academie . . . Française . . .* etc., Paris, 1826. *Études ou discours historiques sur la chute de l'Empire Romain, la naissance et les progrès du Christianisme, et l'invasion des barbares*, Paris, 1852.

[11] Vide: Pref. of *Essai sur les Revolutions;* also, intro. of *Voyage en Amerique*, ed. Paris, 1828, 1: 84, 99, 100, 104, 164.

[12] Vide: *De Napoleon et des Bourbons; et de la nécessité des rallier à nos princes legitimates*, Paris, 1814; a London edition of the same professedly done "*pour le bonheur de France et celui de l'Europe,*" 1814; a London trans. 1814; a German trans. Berlin, 1814; an Italian trans., Padua, 1814; a *Supplement*, Paris, 1814; also trans. at Milan, 1814; vide also St. Edme, *De l'Empereur Napoleon, Refutation de l'écrit de M. Chateaubriand*, Paris, 1814.

[13] Vide: Chateaubriand, *Congrès de Vérona*, Bruxelles, 1838; also Paris, 1838; Leipzig, 1838; a London trans. 1838.

[14] Vide: *De la monarchie selon la charte*, Paris, 1816; London, 1816;

I have gone so much into detail regarding his political career in order to indicate the character and temperament of the man and to suggest that this political prominence may have had something to do with his literary vogue though the reverse is as likely to be true. There is little doubt, though, that the writings unaided have obtained for him no small distinction. The publication of his great book rendered an influence principal which had once been incidental.[15] "The author of the *Génie du Christianisme* remained forever the advocate of poetry and religion, the Knight of the Cross, the Champion of Jesus Christ."[16]

In 1801 he had published an Indian story, *Atala*. In 1805, this tale was reissued with another slightly similar piece called *René*. The Indians whom Chateaubriand presented were somewhat like the "noble savage" of Rousseau or the simple "man of nature" of Wordsworth. By this is meant that his Indians were not true Indians, his savages were not true savages, they were what a highly civilized and well-educated man of romantic inclinations *might* conceive savages *might* be. In other words, the Indian of Chateaubriand, as the ideal men of Rousseau and Wordsworth, was the personality of the writer projected into savage conditions with a temperament so developed as to enjoy emotionally the beauties of Nature.[17] *Atala* and *René*, more than any other works, gave distinction to the name of Chateaubriand among his contemporaries. Since 1805, he has been considered for France the literary innovator, the regenerator of romance.[18]

It has been previously suggested elsewhere that the vogue of Chateaubriand had much to do with the singular reception

a London trans., 1816; also, W. S. Lilly, *Notes on Chateaubriand*, 19th century, 69: 1066.

[15] Vide: Albert Cassagne, *op. cit.*, avant-propos: "Il fut homme d'action par essence et poète par accident. Comme, du fait des circonstances et grâce aux admirables moyens d'expression dont bénéficia Chateaubriand, l'accident est, aux yeux de la postérité, devenu l'essential."

[16] M. F. A. de Lescure: *Chateaubriand*, Paris, 1892, p. 151.

[17] Pref. *Voyage en Amerique*, ed. Paris, 1828, pp. 76-78 read like an extract from Rousseau. Also, pp. 250, 253, 272.

[18] Lescure, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

which the French reading public accorded to the novels of Cooper, and also much to do with the difference of the attitude of the French critics from the attitude of the English and the American reviewers. The Cooper books were read with avidity,—most of them were translated within a year of their first appearance in America,—read with avidity by a people which had been educated to a romantic view of America, by a people for whose benefit the Indian had been exploited as the ideal man next to Nature through "a wild succession of wild imaginings of American life and scenery." Thus it happened that, while the American reviewers of Cooper referred to facts,[19] and even accused Cooper of idealisation,[20] and charged that he had merely transfigured and exalted Indians plagiarized out of Heckewelder; [21] and while the English, prepared by innumerable volumes of American travel, took his descriptions for fact, treated him as a realist,[22] and charged that he had degraded the Indians;[22] the French insisted on taking him as a romanticist and comparing him with Scott.

It would be best, before we start to show the influence of the Chateaubriand vogue on the criticism of Cooper, to take a survey of Chateaubriand's America. In the preface to *Atala,* Chateaubriand remarked: "I do not know if the public will like this story, which leaves all beaten paths and presents a nature and manners entirely foreign to Europe. . . . It is a sort of a poem, part descriptive, part dramatic, and consists entirely in a picture of two lovers who walk and talk in the solitude, in a picture of the passions of love in the midst of the calm of the wilderness." [24] The tale is the story of the return to Nature of the old Indian Chactas, of his affection for the beautiful Atala, of their mutual happiness and love, and of her death by the side of a woodland chancel. *René* is the tale of two who have both "sadness in the depths

[19] Francis Parkman in *No. Amer. Rev.*, Jan., 1852.
[20] *North American Review*, July, 1826.
[21] *No. Amer. Rev.*, April, 1828; Heckewelder, *On the Indians.*
[22] *Edinburgh Rev.*, 1829, 50: 128; 1835, 51: 24; 1849, 89: 91.
[23] *Blackwood's*, 1824, 16: 427.
[24] *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Garnier,—3: 3.

of their hearts." [25] As brother and sister they grow into a beautiful and true sympathy towards one another. Finally, as the story runs, Amelie hastens away to enter a convent; René follows after, intent on interfering with her reception; but he is overmastered by the glorious sweet sadness of the scene, and by the marvelous influence of religion; [26] and so desists. He goes then to America, to plunge himself into Solitude and to seek consolation in the depths of the forest.

The distinctive thing about these tales, as in the other works of Chateaubriand, seems to be their exaggeration of the sentimental and romantic phase of each incident.[27] Nature is used as a background to the soul of man. It was the use of local colours and the audacity of description, combined with strong sentiment, that rendered Chateaubriand unique. At the suggestion of contemporary critics, he made some minor changes in later editions but the story remained essentially romantic. A recent writer has remarked that "Chateaubriand's Indians are blood relations of Richardson's heroines. No other beings ever possessed so much sensibility, such delicate nerves. Enough tears are shed in his romances to irrigate the desert lands of Arizona and to make the barren plains of New Mexico blossom like the rose. Young men and maidens, old men and lusty warriors, all dissolve in tears. Once they flowed in such torrents that they could be heard." [28] We will quote a single short paragraph to illustrate the peculiar mood of Chateaubriand: Céluta entered the hut, blushing, passed in front of the strangers, bent over to the matron's ear, said a few words to her in a low voice, and retired. Her dress, made of the white bark of the mulberry tree, waved gently behind her, and two pink heels raised the edge at every step. The air remained scented, where she had passed, with the odour

[25] *Ibid.*, 3: 75. [26] *Ibid.*, 3: 90.

[27] This tendency appears in the relation of historical events, Pref. *Hist. de Voyages*, in *Voyage en Amerique*, 1828, 1: 60.

[28] E. K. Armstrong, "Chateaubriand in America," *Pub. Mod. Lang. Assn. Amer.*, 1907, 22: 345 ff. It is interesting to read Chateaubriand's defense of the use of tears, Pref. to *Atala*, *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Garnier, 3: 3-4.

of magnolia blooms which surrounded her head: thus did Hero appear at the fêtes of Abydos, thus did Venus reveal herself in the Carthagenian woods, by her bearing and the ambrosial odour which her hair scattered about." [29] The Indian women wear veils made of bark; and one even went in swimming with a veil on. In florid language and elegant style, Chateaubriand wrote vividly of the luxuriance of the forest and the gorgeous drapery of leaves. Into the hearts of the savages he instilled a high idealism; and the crudities of their wilderness life he covered with the glamour of old romance.[30] Chateaubriand's America was a world of dreams.[31]

Les Natchez and the *Voyage en Amerique,* two later publications, while they had not so much influence nor so great a sale as *Atala* and *René,* are nevertheless interesting in their further revelation of Chateaubriand's conception of the Indian.[32] The *Voyage en Amerique,* which pretends to be merely a record of travel through New York and down the Mississippi, with some supplementary information, is very vague and indefinite as to dates and places, suggestive and general as to customs and laws,[33] and very enthusiastic over the pleasantness of the life and the nobility of the Indian character. Chateaubriand praises almost everything,[34] even finding excuse for the bad.[35] Cruel customs are held up, not as

[29] *Les Natchez, Oeuvres complètes,,* ed. Garnier, 3: 190.

[30] *Voyage en Amerique,* ed. Paris, 1828, 2: 159, "Pourquoi les solitudes de l'Erie et de l'Ontario se présentent-elles aujourd'hui avec plus de charme à ma pensée, que le brilliant spectacle du Bosphore? C'est qu'à l'époque de mon voyage aux Etats-Unis j'étais plein d'illusion."

[31] Georges Bertrin, who wrote the *Catholic Encyclopedia* article, has written, in defense, *Problems d'hist. littér. à propos de Chateaubriand, Le Correspondant,* 198 (n. s. 162): 914 ff.; 200 (n. s. 164): 113 ff. "En 1791 . . . à 23 ans . . . lecteur enthousiaste de J.-J. Rousseau, il aspirait à poursuivre le bonheur loin de la société des hommes, il brûlait de contempler cette idéale Nature, libre et sauvage, dont on celebrait chaleureusement le beauté."

[32] *Voyage en Amerique,* ed. Paris, 1828,—1: 211, 227, 130-131.

[33] *Ibid.,* 1: 224, 304. [34] *Ibid.,* 1: 37, 38-9, 220; 2: 42, 52.

[35] *Ibid.,* 1: 227, 236, 272, 285-6—"Du seul examen de ces langues il resulte que des peuples par nous surnommés *Sauvages* étoient fort avancées dans cette civilisation qui tient à la combination des idées. Les détails de leur gouvernement confirmeront de plus en plus cette verité."

specimens of cruelty, but as evidences of nobility of character. The lack of old monuments is compensated by the impressive monuments of Nature and of Liberty, "mère de toute société humaine."[36] The physical slavery of the women is compensated, in Chateaubriand's mind, by their high standing in family matters and in the councils of the tribe.[37]

Throughout the work there are many charming descriptions or ordinary phenomena which might easily have been imagined, or even seen, in France,—all in the most flowery language. With avidity the author seizes upon any ruins, any relics of the past, any indications of a pristine greatness.[39] "Whatever they may be now, an unknown nation, a nation superior to the present generation of Indians, has lived in this wilderness. What was this nation? What change has destroyed it?"[40] This was the revival of the past, so characteristic of Romanticism. The natives themselves are shown with a high regard for reason, justice, and honour.[41] There is praise for their ingenuity, their reverence for age and wisdom, their kind and generous primitive hospitality;[42] and *mirabile dictu,* even for their religion.[43] Civilization,—Protestant civilization of course,—is arraigned severely for the evils it has wrought, from 1791-1827,[44] for the almost complete destruction of the noble and truly American character,[45] for the introduction of strong liquors, for the sickness brought in, for the destructive wars,[46] for moral and religious corruption,[47] and for stimulus to deceit in trading.[48] The life which Chateaubriand depicts is not truly a savage life;—it is a primitive civilization based on natural principles rather than false conventions, a civilization comparable to those of the noblest nations of antiquity, the Greeks, the Romans, and the Hebrews.[49] It is to be noticed that Chateaubriand takes pains to free the

[36] *Ibid.*, 1: 99.
[37] *Ibid.*, 1: 130-131, 149 ff., 195.
[39] *Ibid.*, 1: 163.
[40] *Ibid.*, 1: 123, 124.
[41] *Ibid.*, 119-120, 124. Vol. I.
[42] *Ibid.*, 2: 103.
[43] *Ibid.*, 2: 110-111.
[44] *Ibid.*, 2: 82.
[45] *Ibid.*, 1: 161, 100, 190.
[46] *Ibid.*, 1: 132, 134.
[47] *Ibid.*, 2: 42.
[48] *Ibid.*, 2: 94.
[49] *Ibid.*, 2: 105.
[49] *Ibid.*, 2: 103-4.

Catholic Church from blame in this degradation. The Faith had helped, he said, to soften the ferocious characteristics. "It was in the name of a God sacrificed by men that the Missionaries obtained the abolition of human sacrifices; they planted the Cross in the place of the torture stake, and the blood of Jesus Christ saved the blood of the prisoner." [50] The French spirit and the Catholic Faith were consistent with, and proper for, the noble character of the Indian. The separation did much harm.[51]

As early as 1827, in the *American Quarterly Review*,[52] objection was registered against Chateaubriand's *Atala* on the grounds that the picture of Indian life was false. An English magazine, the *Foreign and Continental Miscellany* in 1828, also spoke in the same tone.[53] Later the *Voyage en Amerique* has been attacked and classed as a fiction, rather than truth. Gribble,[54] declared that, if, as is stated, Chateaubriand embarked 8 April 1791, arrived at Baltimore 10 July 1791, and re-embarked at Philadelphia 10 December 1791, under the conditions then existing, it was not possible for a person to make the journey supposedly recorded in that time. Bédier [55] declared the journeys false, saying that Chateaubriand could have gone no further than Niagara in the time indicated, and that we cannot even be sure that Chateaubriand visited Philadelphia.[56] Bédier charged plagiarism and mentioned five works of travel on which he believed Chateaubriand had drawn.[57] A single dissenting voice,[59] a man who had lived in the Ohio country through which Chateaubriand had gone, pro-

[50] *Ibid.*, 2: 40.
[51] *Ibid.*, 106-107, 118.
[52] December, p. 46.
[53] 1: 468.
[54] *Chateaubriand and his Court of Women*, Chap. IV.
[55] *Chateaubriand en Amerique, verité et fiction*, Rev. d'hist. littér. de la France, v. 6, 501 ff.; 7: 59 ff.; 8: 80 ff.; later reprinted in *Études Critiques*, Paris, 1903.
[56] 6: 526-7: "Chateaubriand n'a pas visité les regions où son imagination a si longtemps vécu."—p. 532.
[57] *Études Critiques*, p. 196.—Charlevoix, Paris, 1774; Bartram, Phila., 1791; Carver, London, 1792; Le Page du Pratz, Paris, 1758; Bonnet, Paris, 1795.
[58] Mr. Madison Statters, *Chateaubriand et l'Amerique*, Grenoble, 1905.

tested in 1905 that the journey could have been made in the specified time, and he attempted to defend Chateaubriand's picture of the Indians. But probably the most damaging article of all appeared the same year from the pen of M. Ernst Dick.[58] This writer declared that there had been no "vieux manuscript" dating from before 1800 from which Chateaubriand had professed to draw *Atala, René, Voyage en Amerique,* and *Les Natchez,* and that the *Voyage en Amerique* was not a work "entierement redigé," but a composition dating later than 1824.[60] He added to Bédier's list of *sources* two new titles.[61] One of these, a travel book by a certain J. C. Beltrami, he claimed to have been the chief basis of the *Voyage en Amerique;* he quoted in parallel columns many long passages to convict Chateaubriand of deliberate plagiarism;[62] he pointed out that the *Foreign and Continental Miscellany* had offered the same charge in 1828; he recalled that Chateaubriand cites Beltrami three times; he suggested that Chateaubriand, the eminent statesman, had purchased the silence of Beltrami the insignificant judiciary; and he quoted a Preface by Beltrami to another work: "M. Chateaubriand a vien voulu me citer avec éloge et m'emprunter quelques pages dans son *Voyage en Amerique.*" [63]

The great French critic, Sainte-Beuve, had criticised Chateaubriand rather harshly about the middle of the century;[64] and of recent years, aside from the work of Bédier and of Dick, W. Wright Roberts has accused him of imitating and even of plagiarizing from the Scotch poet James Beattie, from Milton's minor poems as well as from *Paradise Lose,*[65] from James

[58] *Plagiats de Chateaubriand,* Bern, 1905.

[60] *Ibid.,* p. 46-51.

[61] Beltrami, *Pilgrimage,* New Orleans, 1824; Eng. trans., London, 1825; Mackenzie, *Hist. Fur Trade,* London, 1801.

[62] *Plagiats,* etc., pp. 5-45.

[63] Pref. to *La Mexique,* Paris, 1830. *Plagiats,* etc., pp. 1-5.

[64] Ste.-Beuve: *Étude sur Chateaubriand,* Oeuvres complètes, 1861, ed. Do.: *Chateaubriand et son group littéraire sous l'empire,* 1878. Victor Giraud: *Chateaubriand; études litteraires,* Paris, 1911. Do.: *Nouvelles études sur Chateaubriand,* Paris, 1912.

[65] This does not refer to Chateaubriand's translation.

Thomson's *Seasons,* and even a phrase from Shakespeare.[66] Two writers in the *Modern Language Review,*[67] have traced plagiarism of an incident in *Les Natchez* from an Indian tale by Mrs. Sarah Wentworth Morton, published in Boston, 1790, entitled *Oubai, or the Virtues of Nature.* They have referred to a reprint of the incident in *Spectateur du Nord, "revue fondée a Hamburg,"* with the explanatory words: "le fond de ce conte est tiré d'un poème anglais imprimé à Boston, sous le titre: The Virtues of Nature."

The latest, and it seems to me the best, of the defenses of Chateaubriand appeared in the *Revue d' histoire littéraire de la France* in 1909, written by Pierre Martine.[68] He points out several early references in other writings of Chateaubriand to the old manuscript. His chief thesis for Chateaubriand turns on the meaning of the word *"extrait,* au sens que ce mot a vers 1800." He shows that Chateaubriand shortly returned from America, very naturally reviewed for the various publications with which he was connected several books of travel, especially the Mackenzie book; and that these *extraits* in the book reviews—each a sort of quotation with a running fire of the reviewer's comment, in their original manuscripts, were joined with authentic American notes, dating from before 1800 and with pages written 1825-1827 in the midst of enthusiasm over America and of anti-Napoleonic sentiment—all put together in haste to meet a popular demand, and in many places authenticated and elaborated from Beltrami.

But, plagiarist or none, the essential point which we shall note is that the picture which Chateaubriand drew for the French was essentially untrue, imagined romance, not fact. Miss Emma Kate Armstrong in the 1907 publication of the Modern Language Association of America has shown the falsity of Chateaubriand's representation by merely stating the facts of the *Voyage* in plain unelaborated succession.[69] It is easy to

[66] *Quelques sources anglaises de Chateaubriand,* Rev. d'hist. littér. d. l. France, année, p. 98 ff.

[67] January, 1913, 8: 15.

[68] 16: pp. 429-478.

[69] Volume 22, pp. 345-370.

see, as Miss Armstrong has put it, that tropical foliage does not grow, nor tropical birds and animals live, in Central New York. She finds his descriptions faulty at almost every turn of the narrative. Research has discovered in the United States Government archives the letter of introduction which Chateaubriand bore to Washington,[70] and also discovered in a Baltimore Catholic seminary a contemporary manuscript in which a priest mentions Chateaubriand's presence on board the Saint-Pierre on the 1791 voyage.[71] Miss Armstrong concludes: "A careful examination of Chateaubriand's works shows that two of his statements about his visit to America may be accepted without hesitation: he came to Baltimore, and his letter of introduction from the Marquis de la Rouerie was received by Washington." [72] For the rest, we shall take the works as inspired romance. Such was their influence.

Chateaubriand was the first European writer to make America the scene and the Indian the subject of his romances. He returned from America, throbbing with the harmonies of solitude. What though *Atala* was not, as he said, written "sous les huttes des sauvages," [73] what though the muse which inspired him in the "enchanted" [74] country of the *Natchez* did not march "devant les pas du voyageur, à travers les régions inconnues du Nouveau-Monde pour lui découvrir les secrets ravissants des deserts," [75] what though he was romancing, even in the ostensibly authentic *Voyage,* and was not, as he claimed to be, a "faithful historian?" [76] What of all these when *"Il a renouvellé pour un siècle l'imagination française."* [77]

This America then, the America of Chateaubriand, an America of fiction and romance rather than fact, had been exploited before the French nation. His Indians were noble and enlightened, subject to true emotions, and cognizant of the meaning and power of the Catholic Faith. It was this type of Indian with which Cooper's Indians had to compete, when the Leather-Stocking tales were translated into French. Cha-

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 351.
[71] *Ibid.*, p. 348.
[72] *Ibid.*, p. 370.
[73] Preface to *Atala.*
[74] *Voyage en Amerique,* ed. Paris, 1828, 1: 202.
[75] Preface to *Les Natchez.*
[76] *Ibid.*
[77] Bédier, *op. cit.*, 6: 501.

teaubriand had been popular. The *Voyage en Amerique* was issued separatesly 29 times in the nineteenth century, six of these before 1840; *Les Natchez,* 18 times, four before 1840; *Atala,* or *Atala et René,* 52 times, 16 before 1840, and the *Oeuvres completes* 48 times, 22 before 1840.[78] There have been innumerable extracts and selections, though most of these since 1840. Then, too, it must not be forgotten that *Atala* and *René* were included as incidents in *Le Gènie du Christianisme,* and that much of the vogue of that book has been attributed to the success of these two tales.[79] The figures for the editions of the *Gènie du Christianisme* are 48 for the nineteenth century and 13 before 1840. The figures for the editions during the whole century indicate the popularity of Chateaubriand in France, a popularity with which Cooper had to compete.[80] The figures for the editions before 1840 show to some degree how the Chauteaubriand idea, false as it was, was already well established in France when Cooper began to bid for favour. I took the date 1840 with reference to Chateaubriand because it will be remembered that Cooper's reputation in France did not begin to gain headway among the critics until 1831, although a "reading public" stimulated by La Fayette's visit to America, had early been enthusiastic over the Cooper books themselves.

Cooper sold well, then, to a people nourished on Chateaubriand. We have mentioned, earlier in this paper, that the French, in contradistinction to the English and the American reviewers, insisted on regarding Cooper as a romancer.[81] As such, the American novelist received what Balzac called "l'admiration passionée de la France."[82] Thus one writer called him "le vraie poète de l'Amerique;[83] the Globe per-

[78] These facts have been extracted from a bibliography built on the basis of editions in *C.U.L., N.Y.P.L., British Museum Cat.,* and *Catalogue Général de la bibliothèque national,* Paris, 1906.

[79] Lescure, *op. cit.,* p. 151.

[80] French ed. only are given.

[81] Morris Cooper in "Nineteenth Century Criticism in France" gives a rather full summary of the bare facts of Cooper's critical reputation. From that most of the facts in the preceding paragraph are drawn.

[82] *Revue parisienne,* 1840, p. 72.

[83] Louis de Loménie, *Galerie des contemporains illustres,* 1845.

sistently compared him with Scott;[84] as a romanticist he was accused of being cold, colourless, dry, over-descriptive, and sterile in invention,[85] and of lacking style and artistic beauty equal to Scott;[86] but he was granted the credit of being somewhat more true to life[87] where he was less poetic.[88]

Critics pointed to the preface of the Leather-Stocking Series where Cooper claimed "the privilege of all writers of fiction" and held that Cooper thought himself a romancer.[89] George Sand quoted Cooper's elaborate praise of "the temple of the wilderness"[90] and gave a long speech of Nathaniel to a white as follows:

"Je ne dis rien contre votre civilisation, contre vos arts, vos monuments, votre commerce, vos religions, vos prêtres. Tout cela est beau et bon sans doute; mais ici, dans mon désert j'habite un plus beau temple que vos églises; je contemple de plus sublimes monuments que ceux èlevés par l'homme; je comprends mieux la Divinité que vos prêtres."[91]

She speaks of Cooper in relation to Chateaubriand as follows:

"Plus vrai et plus renseigné que Chateaubriand n'avait fait qu'entrevoir et supposer, il nous a fait pénétrer dans la realité comme dans la poésie de la vie sauvage, dans ses vertus homeriques, dans son héroïsme effrayant, dans sa sublime barbarie."[92]

* * * *

I believe I have shown to some degree at least what I set out to show—what sort of a man Chateaubriand created for an Indian, the degree of truth in the picture and a connection between the vogue of the Chateaubriand idea and the singular reception accorded Cooper by the French, a connection which tended to make the French critics compare the Indians of Cooper, not with fact, but with the romantic fiction of Chateaubriand.

ELBRIDGE COLBY.

[84] Ziesung: *Le Globe et l'Ecole romantique*, 1880.

[85] Philarète, Chasles, *Études sur la littér. anglo-amer.*, 1851; 50.

[86] See note 3. [87] Chasles, *op. cit.*, "S'il est prosaique, il est vrai."

[88] See note 3. [89] Chasles Philarète, *op. cit.*

[90] *Autour du table* (1856), p. 270. *La Nouvelle Revue*, 16: 1882, p. 138, compares Longfellow's Indians to Chateaubriand's Indians.

[91] *Autour du Table*, p. 270. [92] *Ibid.*, p. 269.

THE MALTHUSIAN PRINCIPLE OF POPULATION.

II

In the April number of the BULLETIN there was given an account of the "principle of population" together with some of the chief sources from which Malthus derived his theory. The present paper will undertake to weigh the merits of that theory.

There was a vast literature on population before the time of Malthus. Malthus carved out of this body of literature what he conceived to be its essential truth and gave it his name and a formulation of his own. Since the time of Malthus the discussion of theories of population has increased, and on account of the prominence attained by Malthus, it has seemed necessary for later writers to align themselves either on his side of the discussion or in opposition to him. However, there are no writers today who accept the Malthusian statement in its entirety, and there are few, if any, who really reject it totally. The difference of opinion today is largely a difference as to how the principle is to be stated.

Malthus states the principle in its crassest form in the first edition of his Essay. It is essentially this: Population when unchecked increases in a geometrical ratio; subsistence increases at most in an arithmetical ratio. An absolutely necessary consequence of these facts is misery; a highly probable consequence, although not absolutely necessary, is vice. A second formulation of the principle is contained in the second and succeeding editions. It differs from the first in that, along with misery and vice, *moral restraint* is given as one of the means by which population is kept within the bounds of subsistence, and by moral restraint is meant "a restraint from marriage from prudential motives, with a conduct strictly moral during the period of this restraint." The geometrical and arithmetical ratios are to be found in all of the editions of the Essay, and, as being easily stated and understood, they did much to popularize

Malthus's name. On this account those critics are not wholly to blame who insist upon judging the Malthusian claims on the basis of the merits of these ratios. On the other hand, many critics feel that Malthus made a real contribution to a clear understanding of the problem of population and that it is only fair to his memory to overlook some of the over-statements which he made in the excess of his zeal for his "principle." Perhaps for the majority of these critics a third statement of the principle might be formulated thus: Population naturally tends to increase more rapidly than food, and consequently the world is kept from being overstocked through the operation of the checks of misery, vice, and moral restraint. A fourth and somewhat milder formulation of the Malthusian principle is that of Giddings (*Principles of Sociology,* p. 336): "In any given state of industry and the arts population tends to increase faster than it is possible to raise the general plane of living."

It will be readily seen that the difference between the first and the last of the above formulations is considerable. The first says that population does actually crowd upon subsistence so persistently that misery necessarily results and that vice practically results. The last says that *if* the methods of production are not improved in the meantime, the tendency of population to increase will work effectually against the efforts of the people to improve their general well-being. But since it often, if not usually, happens that an increase of population results in a change in the methods of production Giddings's formulation of the principle is far from the pessimism of the original theory. He believes, however, that it has sufficient bite in it to warrant his conclusion that "when industry is static, as socialism would make it forever, the full rigor of the Malthusian law must be felt, and socialism must prove to be only the negative complement of the perpetual motion delusion."

The first and second formulations given above take the geometrical and arithmetical ratios for granted. It was these ratios which popularized the "principle," but with their overthrow, it is merely injured, not killed, and it falls back on the third line of defences. Population, when unchecked, increases in a geometrical ratio, Malthus tells us, while food supply in-

creases in an arithmetical ratio. Of course, population does not actually increase in a geometrical ratio for any great length of time, Malthus would say, but the reason that it does not do so is that it is "checked," *i. e.*, the people die off or are not born because of lack of food, bad sanitation, and vice, and for other reasons (which he denominates checks.) It is sometimes urged against Malthus's reasoning at this point that he has no right to compare a possible increase of population with an actual increase of food. He should, it is argued, compare his abstract geometrical ratio of population, not with a concrete and actual arithmetical increase in food supply, but with a hypothetical geometrical ratio of increase in animal and vegetable food due to the fact that plant and animal life have an abstract tendency to increase in geometrical ratio. To the present writer there does not seem to be any merit in this criticism. As good a case could be made against the physicist who works out a hypothetical law of falling bodies and then compares his law with what actually happens when a body falls. If he finds that his law does not correspond to the concrete facts of the case, he is well warranted in examining and explaining the "checks" which account for the variation between the hypothetical and the actual. A valid criticism of Malthus's ratios, it seems to the present writer, will be concerned with his facts rather than with his method.

Has population a tendency to increase in geometrical ratio, or, more definitely, is the procreative instinct in man such that in the absence of counteracting checks, population would double itself at least once every twenty-five years? It is not easy to give an entirely satisfactory answer to this question on statistical grounds, for the reason that we do not find any populations which are increasing absolutely without check. It took Germany nearly a hundred years in the nineteenth century to double its population. In the same time the French increased in numbers only forty-five per cent. These figures are far below the demands of Malthus's statement, but then, it must be remembered that the Malthusian checks of misery, vice, and moral restraint, as well as other checks, have been at work in holding down the numbers during the time of these increases. These

statistics, therefore, neither confirm nor overthrow the Malthusian contention.

Where such influences as immigration and emigration need not be considered, increases and decreases in numbers result from the relation between the birth-rate and the death-rate. It is usual to consider the death-rate as the average number of deaths per year to a thousand of the population. Likewise the birth-rate is usually based upon the number of births to a thousand of the population, although for certain statistical purposes, this "crude" birth-rate is sometimes rejected in favor of the number of births per thousand women of child-bearing ages, or per thousand married women of child-bearing ages. Where the crude birth-rate exceeds the death-rate by 30, we have a doubling of population in less than twenty-five years. That we do not often find so great a surplus of births over deaths does not argue so much an absence of the necessary instinct in human beings for procreation, as the existence of "checks." An examination of some of the statistics, while not proving it, will at least suggest the existence of the instinct in sufficient strength to establish the possibility of a geometrical increase as rapid as was assumed by Malthus. In recent years there has been a falling off in the death-rate in all European countries, due to the increasing knowledge of the rules of health and improved sanitation. Along with this decreased death-rate, there has been likewise a universal decrease in the "crude" birth-rate. It seems more reasonable to charge the decreasing birth-rate up to vice and moral restraint and other preventive checks than to a change in the instinct to procreate. Taking this view of the matter, European populations are far from increasing as rapidly as they would increase if "unchecked." In Italy, for example, in 1885, the birth-rate was 38.7 per thousand and the death-rate was 27.1, leaving an effective surplus of 11.6 with which to augment the population. In 1907 Italy's birth-rate was 31.4, and her death-rate was 20.8, making a surplus of 10.6 births over deaths. If Italy's birth-rate had not fallen between 1885 and 1907, while this great improvement was being made in the death-rate, the surplus for 1907 would have been 17.9 as against the actual 10.6 surplus for that year. This is, however, still

far from our imagined surplus of 30. Hungary in 1885 had a birth-rate of 44.8 and a death-rate of 31.9, leaving a surplus of 12.9. In 1906 Hungary's birth-rate had fallen to 36.0 and her death-rate to 24.8, leaving a difference of 11.2. The birth-rate in the Netherlands decreased between 1885 and 1906 from 34.4 to 30.4 and the death-rate decreased from 21.0 to 14.8. Suppose, now, that Hungary's birth-rate remained at the figure for 1885 and that at the same time she had been able to improve sanitary conditions to such a degree as to reduce her death-rate not simply to her own death-rate for 1906, but to that of Holland for that year. The result would be a surplus of births over deaths of 30 per thousand, a surplus well above the need for establishing Malthus's claim. There would seem, therefore, to be no good grounds for denying Malthus's contention that an *unchecked* population might easily double its numbers every twenty-five years. Of course, it is not necessary in establishing the tendency to a geometrical ratio of increase to show that it would if unchecked double itself every twenty-five years. Even if it doubles itself once every hundred years, as Germany has actually done, and as Great Britain has much more than done, the case is established for the abstract tendency to increase in geometrical progression.

While population tends to increase in a geometrical ratio, subsistence for man, says Malthus, increases in an arithmetical ratio. While population tends to double itself every twenty-five years, the slower increase in subsistence counteracts this tendency and keeps population from actually doubling itself every twenty-five years. Or to state the tendency in figures, in twenty-five-year periods the population if unchecked would increase in the ratio 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, etc. In the corresponding periods, subsistence for man can increase at most, according to Malthus, in the ratio 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc. But since the 4, 8, 16, etc. of population cannot subsist on the 3, 4, 5, etc. of food, the increase of population is necessarily held back. Let us now examine the foundation for this arithmetical increase of subsistence.

While it is true that food for man often grows spontaneously and unaided by man, it seldom does so on a scale large enough to supply the needs of any considerable population. We need to

consider, therefore, only the manner in which food increases when encouraged by man's efforts. The labor power of population 1, we are told, can produce a food supply of 1; the labor power of population 2 can produce a food supply 2; but the labor power of population 4 can at most produce a food supply 3. That this principle is not universally true can be easily shown. Assuming that the third and fourth contingents of labor are as efficient workers as the first and second, and that as the labor power has been increased, the *area of cultivated land* has been increased in the same proportion, there is every reason to believe that when the population reaches 4, the subsistence will likewise reach 4, other things being equal. To this a Malthusian might reply that Malthus had in mind the case of England with its supply of land limited. This, however, was not Malthus's thought. He says in the first chapter that "there is still a great portion of uncultivated land" in England and Scotland, and he thinks of the increased population as applying its energies to the cultivation of an ever-increasing area of land. Granting the extension of the area cultivated, Malthus is not justified in asserting that "the most enthusiastic speculator cannot suppose a greater increase than that the produce of this island might be increased every twenty-five years by a quantity equal to what it at present produces," provided, for instance, that during the twenty-five years, there *is added* to the labor supply an amount of labor twice as great as that which produces the present produce of the island.

But even if we grant that the land of England is all occupied, and that the increased population must subsist from the area which formerly supplied the smaller population, it does not follow that an increase in population from 2 to 4 will be accompanied by an increase of food supply from 2 to 3 only. To make this clear it will be convenient at this point to consider the law of diminishing returns.

The law of diminishing returns has been stated in various ways, and much confusion has arisen over misunderstandings as to what it is meant to include. For our purpose it will be convenient to give to it the general meaning which it usually has in current economic literature, and to state it somewhat nar-

rowly. In the cultivation of a given area of ground, experience tells us, as we add to our labor expenditure, other things being equal, we finally reach a point beyond which, if we continue to add to the labor expenditure, the product of the land will not increase in proportion to the increase in the quantity of labor expended. If this were not true, in other words, if additional expenditures of labor on the same land always gave a return in product in proportion to the amount of labor expended, the human race would not need to spread out over the face of the earth. Sufficient food for the entire human race could be found in France or in England or in Ohio. But since the law of diminishing returns is true, it does not pay to work a part of the land too intensively while there is other good land which can be had conveniently and which is not worked at all or is only worked lightly. While this truth is recognized by nearly everyone who has given the matter any thought, it is impossible to say in the case of any given piece of land, because of certain varying factors, just exactly what is the rate at which the proportionality of return falls off as the labor expenditure is increased. By experiment, however, approximately correct results might be obtained. For our purpose we shall have figures sufficiently accurate if we borrow from Walker an illustration which he considers typical of the situation (and we here condense Walker's statement).

Suppose that ten laborers are engaged in cultivating in common a tract of land of a hundred acres, producing 2,000 bushels of wheat a year, being 20 bushels per acre and 200 bushels per capita. Now suppose that two laborers join themselves to the company. Will the crop be 2,400 bushels, or more, or less? The answer will depend upon whether the point of diminishing returns has been reached with the original ten laborers. If not the crop may be more than 2,400 bushels. But let us suppose that the point of diminishing returns has already been reached, and that the crop produced by the twelve laborers amounts to 2,280 bushels, each acre producing 22.8 bushels. Each man will then receive 190 bushels as his share. Now suppose that three additional laborers are added to the company. Will the new product be such as to give to each of the laborers 190 bush-

els as before? Not if the industrial character of the laborers and the knowledge of the art of agriculture undergo no change. If twelve laborers make the land yield but 22.8 bushels per acre, the fifteen cannot make the same amount of land yield 28.5 bushels per acre. The crop will be something less than that: say, 27 bushels per acre, which would give each man 180 bushels and which would make a total crop of 2,700 bushels. Again, suppose that five additional laborers join the company. The crop will not now be 36 bushels per acre as would be necessary, in order to give each man 180 bushels, which the first fifteen received. The crop could not be forced by the labor of twenty laborers above say, 32 bushels per acre, which would give each of the laborers 160 bushels and which would make a total product of 3,200 bushels. I have borrowed these figures from Walker in preference to making an assumption of my own because the figures were worked out as typical of actual conditions and without any thought of their being used in the refutation of the Malthusian parallel series. Nevertheless, they serve admirably to overturn the Malthusian arithmetical progression. In Walker's illustration, no account is taken of advantages of division of labor. We may, therefore, consider that two men on twenty acres of land of the assumed quality, would produce proportionately as much as ten men on a hundred acres. Two men working on twenty acres would produce twenty bushels per acre or a total of 400 bushels. Without going through the intermediate steps, we find that four men on twenty acres would produce proportionately as much as twenty men on a hundred acres. They would, therefore, produce 32 bushels per acre, or a total of 640 bushels, which would be 160 bushels per laborer. According to Malthus, as we increase the labor supply from two to four, we can at the very utmost, increase the food supply from 2 to 3. But according to Walker's assumption, which he considers typical and which undoubtedly is representative of actual conditions, we find that while we increase the labor supply from 2 to 4, we may, without any change in the art of agriculture, increase the product from 400 to 640. This is a greater increase than Malthus's parallel series would admit as possible. True, if we proceed far enough in applying additional labor to a definite

area of land, we shall reach a point, provided that we do not change our agricultural methods, where the increase in product will be necessarily less than Malthus's limit, but on the other hand, when cultivation is near the point of diminishing returns, the increase in product will be much more than the Malthusian formula will permit. Now, a general law which admits of as many exceptions as there are cases which follow the rule, is very much in need of re-statement.

There is therefore no ground for holding that with population increasing in geometrical progression, subsistence can increase only in arithmetical progression. There is no ground for holding this to be universally correct even where emigration and foreign trade and improved methods in production are not called into requisition. Where a population avails itself of any or all of these expedients, the diverging mathematical lines, as conceived by Malthus, are still farther from the truth.

The population of England and Wales increased in the nineteenth century from 9,250,000 to 32,527,000, and this increase took place in the presence of an increasing average standard of living. This would not have happened in the face of the law of diminishing returns, if the people had lived from the products of the same land cultivated in the same way in 1800 and in 1900. But England is a manufacturing country, and is, on this account, released, to a certain extent, from the rigors of the law of diminishing returns. Indeed, it is often said that the law of diminishing returns does not apply to manufacturers, but on the contrary, this branch of production is subject to a law of increasing returns. Perhaps a more accurate expression would be that manufactures are subject to a law of diminishing costs, due to large scale production. Where a nation lives by manufacturing it will often happen that the advantages which come to it from the development of its industries which accompanies its growth in population, will offset or more than offset the disadvantage which arises from the fact that its food supply which it acquires by exchange is produced under conditions of diminishing returns. To illustrate, let us assume a country with a laboring population of four millions. Suppose further that half of these are engaged in agriculture and half in manu-

facture. Let us represent the product in each case at 2. The population doubles in the course of time, and now we have four millions of agricultural workers and four millions engaged in manufacturing. If two millions of agricultural laborers produced a product represented by 2, four millions will not produce a product of 4, other things being equal, if the point of diminishing returns has been passed and the land supply has not been increased. Let us suppose that the four millions produce 3.2. At the same time the laborers engaged in industry have likewise increased from two millions to four millions, but owing to the advantages of large scale production which is pretty generally met with in manufacturing and commerce, their output more than doubles; it increases from 2 to something more than 4. Let us suppose that it increases from 2 to 5. The total product which was originally 2 plus 2, or 4, has now increased to 3.2 plus 5, or 8.2, while the laboring population has increased from four millions to eight millions. In other words, here is an improvement in standard of life accompanying an increasing population.

The strict Malthusian will object to the above demonstration that while an increased *pro rata* production of manufactured goods will usually follow increased applications of labor, yet this increased output is not available for subsistence. Men must have food and they must get the food from the land, no matter how skilful they may be in manufacturing articles of value. Therefore, says the Malthusian, agricultural production and manufacturing are two separate accounts which must be settled separately, and which cannot be balanced off against each other. In the case of a country without foreign trade, this would be true, except, of course, in so far as diminishing costs in manufacturing would leave free an ever-increasing percentage of the population to engage in agriculture. But where a country carries on foreign trade it can get from abroad an ever-increasing proportion of its food supply and pay for it with manufactured goods produced under more favorable conditions than those under which it could produce its own food supply at home. This process can go on as long as there are foreign lands so thinly settled and with industry so little advanced that they con-

sider this trade profitable. This amounts in effect to an increase of the home soil by the addition to it of the foreign.

In a similar way, the rigors of the Malthusian "principle" are mitigated by emigration. The population may increase rapidly and subsistence less rapidly, but the checks of misery and vice and moral restraint need not be called into play because the surplus population leaves the home country and finds a more generous soil abroad. Probably as many persons as there are in France today, emigrated from Europe during the nineteenth century. Such an exodus as this permits of a considerable increase of births over deaths before an increased pressure upon subsistence is felt. In the case of Ireland, more persons have emigrated from the island since 1845 than there are in it today.

In stating the law of diminishing returns above, the proviso was made, "other things being equal." One of these "other things" which were not to be changed is the art of agriculture. But as a matter of fact there are from time to time improvements in agricultural methods, and then "other things" are not equal. These improvements in the methods of agricultural production are sometimes the cause and sometimes the result of increases in the number of the people, but whether cause or effect, they may suspend temporarily some of the consequences of the law of diminishing returns. When a few hundred thouand Indians over-ran the present territory of the United States and lived for the most part from hunting and fishing, they doubtless considered that the land was none too extensive for their numbers. The situation among the Germans in Cæsar's time was somewhat of an improvement over this, for they lived principally from their herds and the land was able to carry a larger number to a given area, than was the case among the American Indians. It is unlikely that the Germans went over from a pastoral to an agricultural mode of life through an apriori speculation of the joys of farming. More probably their numbers increased to such an extent that they found it difficult to provide adequately for their needs by the old methods. Of course, there were other motives, too, but probably none more important than this. With the better provision against want which came with the cultivation of the soil, human life

was conserved and numbers grew. The methods of cultivation were at first rude and relatively unproductive, but as the population demanded ever more and more food, by slow and crude stages improvement was made until the three-field system was discovered, and later, crop rotation and artificial manuring, and improved machinery. With each improvement it was possible for a given area to carry a larger population, and with each great improvement, the larger population came partly as cause and partly as result of the increased food supply. It has been estimated that in Cæsar's time there were in Germany between five and six persons to the square kilometer; in the year 1300, seventeen to twenty; in 1700, twenty-six to twenty-eight; in 1800, forty to forty-five; and in 1895, ninety-two persons to the square kilometer.

The German population of today would be continually on the verge of starvation, if it were compelled to produce its living wholly on German soil with the German agricultural methods of 1300. There would be rank over-population. The same would be true if the population of 1300 had to make its living after the manner of the Germans of Cæsar's time. The question as to the existence of over-population cannot, therefore, be determined by dividing the number of the population by the number of square miles which they occupy. Over-population is relative to the state of the productive arts.

It would be painting entirely too beautiful a picture of the progress of the arts if we were to suppose, however, that as numbers have increased in the past, the corresponding food supply was always at hand for their support. The picture would be truer to life if we were to suppose that there has always been a section of the population who were in want of the necessaries of life. Godwin, in Malthus's day, and a great many optimists since that time have, indeed, held that where a section of the community have suffered for the very necessaries of life, it has been because of man's injustice in distributing wealth, and not because of the niggardliness of nature. There is a certain amount of truth in this contention, but it is true in much the same way as would be the statement that the Germans of 1300 suffered not because of the niggardliness of nature, but

because they had not adopted the more perfect methods of production of the twentieth century. As an increasing population demands a larger output of food, there will be a tendency to supply the demand at the point of least resistance. The point of least resistance may be in the field of technical improvements in machines or methods, or it may be in a fairer distribution of the existing product. In the latter case, the fairer distribution will relieve the distress and permit of raising the lower limits of the standard of life. Population will, if comparatively "unchecked," again sooner or later catch up with food supply, in the sense that a section of the people will feel that they are not as well off as they were formerly. As this feeling develops, renewed pressure will be put upon the intelligence of the community to devise new methods of production. Of course, it is not meant here to assert that methods of production are improved only in response to pressure of population. The generally rising standards of the last century prove the contrary.

As population increases, the principal means of escaping the unfortunate consequences of the agricultural law of diminishing returns, are as we have seen, emigration, development of industry and foreign commerce, and improvement in agricultural methods. Are there limits to these outlets of escape? Let us see. Emigration can continue with profit only until all of the foreign lands are as fully saturated with people as the lands from which the emigration comes. Likewise, when the point of saturation is reached, foreign commerce will no longer supply the home population with food. Various attempts have been made to estimate the amount of increase which can take place before such a condition of saturation is experienced. Some of the least optimistic of these estimates place the number of inhabitants which the earth will carry in the present state of the arts, at six thousand millions. Keeping in mind the fact that the population of the earth has increased from 150 millions to 1,500 millions in the last 1900 years, and that with a surplus rate of births over deaths as low as ten per thousand, the present 1,500 millions will become 6,000 millions in a period of 140 years, it will be realized that the problem is not necessarily out-

side the field of speculation. At this low rate of excess of births over deaths, the population will double itself every seventy years; so if we place the earth's saturation point at 12,000 millions or even 24,000 millions, we simply put the problem off another seventy or one hundred and forty years. The ultimate outlet for population, therefore, will be neither commerce nor emigration, but improved technical processes. Whether invention will always increase as rapidly as population, and thus obviate the necessity of a general lowering in standards of life, is a problem which lies so completely in the field of prophecy that a guess in one direction is about as valuable as a guess in the other. We shall be on more solid ground when we affirm that the probability is that judging from the past the stream of progress will not represent a uniform current, but that there will be rapids and eddies here and there, and that in the less inventive nations or in parts of nations, either population will crowd upon subsistence, producing relative over-population, or the issue will be met by placing checks upon increase in numbers.

And this leads us to say a word about checks. According to Malthus, the numbers of the people are kept within the limits of subsistence by means of three classes of checks,—misery, vice, and self-restraint. It has often been said and it is sometimes even said by Catholic economists that this teaching is immoral. This judgment of Malthus, however, is much too harsh. Malthus was a well-meaning clergyman and he did not wish vice to prevail. True, in his first edition, he considered it all but a necessary consequence of the principle of population; but later he sought to minimise it by preaching moral restraint. Certain later writers were made pessimistic as to the possibility of getting food on easy terms and openly advocated immoral practices. They called themselves neo-Malthusians and thus injured his good name.

The principal objection to Malthus's enumeration of checks is that he did not take sufficient account of other factors which restrict population. For instance, any custom which will raise the average age at which women marry, will tend to counteract the "principle of population." In as far as such putting off of marriage is caused by a fear of inability to procure subsistence,

it may fall under Malthus's heading of " moral restraint." But where it is not simply the result of prudence, but occurs because of the general desire of parents to keep their daughters with them as long as possible, or because the parents find it difficult to furnish a dowry, as custom in some places demands, there is a real check upon Malthus's geometrical series which does not come within his classification. Democracy, modern city life, and the feminist movement are forces in the same direction, and not adequately provided for by Malthus's three-fold classification. Other non-Malthusian checks might also be enumerated. True, all of these result to a greater or less degree in vice, but it is not necessarily vice which is here the check upon the geometrical increase in population.

In summing up our position on the Malthusian theory, we would says that Malthus was partly right and partly wrong with respect to his statement of tendencies, and he was more right a century ago than he would be today. The material progress of the last hundred years has taught us an optimism which laughs at the Malthusian forebodings. On the other hand, the general falling off in the birth-rate (which cannot be said to be a complete refutation of Malthusianism until we have better statistical information concerning the " checks ") has caused people to lose interest in the bogey of over-population. The new competition for the earth by the different nations and races has raised for each people a fear of falling behind in the struggle through lack of numbers rather than a fear of hardship growing out of increased numbers. The prophecy of the present day with respect to numbers which seems most likely to be fulfilled is that the more fecund peoples and races will ultimately inherit the earth. This sobering reflection leads the social philosopher to stress lightly the remnant of truth residing in the Malthusian " principle of population."

FRANK O'HARA.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Chronica Fratris Salimbene de Adam Ordinis Minorum edidit Oswaldus Holder-Egger. Hannoverae et Lipsiae, impensis bibliophilii Hahniani MDCCCCV-MDCCCCXIII. (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica . . . Scriptorum* tomus xxxii). Pp. xxxii + 755.

The development of the critical scientific spirit which has been such a marked feature in modern historical literature and research, has done much to facilitate the study of the sources from which we derive our knowledge of the Middle Ages. Many of the mediæval chronicles, that had hitherto only been accessible in scattered MSS. or in a very defective printed form, have now been brought together, edited by experts and published in convenient and inexpensive collections. Foremost among these collections is the one known under the general title of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. Although edited with special attention to Germany, this series forms by far the best of all the collections of sources for the student of the general history of Western Europe during the Middle Ages. The standard of excellence established by the preceding volumes is fully maintained in the volume before us which contains a critical edition of the famous Chronicle of Salimbene, a Franciscan friar who lived from 1221 to 1288 or about that year.

Up to a comparatively recent date this remarkable work has been practically inaccessible. True, an edition of Salimbene's Chronicle was printed at Parma in 1857, but this edition was made from a very imperfect transcript and it was not until the treasures of the Vatican Library were thrown open to students by Pope Leo XIII that the original MS. of the Chronicle was brought within easy reach and its publication made possible. Students of the history of the thirteenth century have long felt the need of an edition of Salimbene's work which would fulfil the requirements of modern criticism. The present one was, assuredly, worth waiting for. It would have been difficult, perhaps, to have found any one better fitted for the task of editing such a work than Prof.

Holder-Egger, for he is recognized as an authority on all that concerns mediæval chronicles, and it is only to be regretted that he did not live to complete the work. The first and second parts of the edition under review, published in 1905 and 1908 respectively, were edited by Prof. Holder-Egger, but the third part which was issued in 1913, was continued under the auspices of Bernard Schmeidler. Taken as a whole this new edition of Salimbene's Chronicle leaves nothing to be desired. It is a perfect monument of critical skill and pure erudition.

It is impossible to enter here into any detailed consideration of the contents of Salimbene's Chronicle. There is no question that it is one of the most intimate human documents of the thirteenth century. Indeed, it stands out like an illuminated initial in the dull gray text of some crabbed codex. For Salimbene is no ordinary chronicler. As is well known, mediæval chronicles deal for the most part with what are called great men and remarkable occurrences, and they leave us to read between the lines as best we can the details of daily life. Salimbene, on the contrary, is as careful to record the price at which a duck or a dozen of eggs could be bought in this or that place, as he is to set down the deeds of Kings, the decrees of Popes, the outcome of wars, councils and the like. He is in some sort a thirteenth century Pepys. Not only is his narrative intensely interesting, it is also profoundly personal. Salimbene not only witnessed a number of stirring religious and political events himself, but he met and knew many of the most important men of his time. The clearness and vividness of his opinions and descriptions of contemporary men and events, their minuteness as well as their wide range, go to make Salimbene's Chronicle of the utmost value. As a picture of the inner life of the wonderfully interesting period in which its author lived, it is altogether unique.

Take, for example, this account of a banquet given by St. Lewis, King of France, at which Salimbene was present. "Habuimus igitur illa die primo cerasas, postea panem albissimum: vinum quoque ut magnificentia regia dignum erat, abundans et precipuum ponebatur . . . Postea habuimus fabas recentes cum lacte decoctas, pisces et cancros pastillos anguillarum, risum cum lacte amigdalarum et pulvere cynamoni, anguillas assatas cum optimo salsamento, turtas et juncatas et fructus necessarios habuimus abun-

danter atque decenter. Et omnia curialiter fuerunt apposita et sedule ministrata" (pp. 224-25). Of the holy King himself Salimbene gives us this pleasing picture: "Erat autem rex subtilis et gracilis, macilentus convenienter et longus, habens vultum angelicum et faciem gratiosam. Et veniebat . . . non in pompa regali, sed in habitu peregrini, habens capsellam et burdonem peregriniationis ad collum, qui optime scapulas regias decorabat" (p. 222). And here is his description of Frederic II: "Nota quod Fridericus quasi semper dilexit habere discordiam cum ecclesia et eam multipliciter impugnavit, que nutrierat eum, defenderat et exaltaverat. De fide Dei nichil habebat. Callidus homo fuit, versutus, avarus, luxuriosus, malitiosus, iracundus. Et valens homo fuit interdum, quando voluit bonitates et curialitates suas ostendere, solatiosus, jocundus, delitiosus, industrius; legere, scribere et cantare sciebat et cantilena et cantiones invenire; pulcher homo et bene formatus, sed medie stature fuit. Vidi enim eum et aliquando dilexi . . . et ut breviter me expediam, si bene fuisset catholicus et dilexisset Deum et ecclesiam et animam suam, paucos habuisset in imperio pares in mundo" (p. 348).

Unfortunately, the vigor of Salimbene oozes sadly away in any translation. Portions, indeed, of his Chronicle are of such a character that they can hardly be rendered in our more fastidious language. Yet, strange as it may seem, this autobiography of the Parmesan friar was written for the special reading of his niece, who was a Poor Clare, and we may be sure, for the rest, our author never dreamt that posterity would treasure it up as one of the curiosities of mediæval literature.

It seems desirable in connection with this new edition of Salimbene to add a word concerning a volume lately published in London entitled, "From St. Francis to Dante: A translation of all that is of primary interest in the Chronicle of the Franciscan Salimbene," etc., by G. G. Coulton, M. A. (2nd edition, revised and enlarged. London: Dockworth and Co., pp. xiv + 446). This work is based upon the critical edition issued in the *Monumenta* but does not, of course, pretend to be a complete translation of Salimbene's Chronicle. But it contains more of the Chronicle than has hitherto appeared in print in English. A comparison of the selections Mr. Coulton has translated with the Latin text will show how faithful has been his rendering of them. One

wishes, however, that Mr. Coulton had allowed these selections from Salimbene to stand by themselves with none but needful explanatory notes. As it is, Mr. Coulton has done much more than merely translate Salimbene. His translation is interwoven with a kind of running commentary of his own which it is not always easy to disengage from Salimbene's narrative. What is here more trying is the aggressively controversial tone which characterizes Mr. Coulton's volume throughout. Salimbene was, no doubt, very impulsive, rather greatly influenced and somewhat inclined to be a partisan, but he was certainly neither a theorist nor a crotchet-monger. In order, then, to understand and appreciate his account of mediæval life and manners, he should be allowed to tell it in his own way. This is just what Mr. Coulton is reluctant, apparently, to let Salimbene do. He has been at pains to make our Chronicle and the other contemporary sources which he uses to "illustrate" it, serve the purpose of bringing out the darkest side of mediæval life both in the cloister and the world. We are given, in consequence, a picture which is so one-sided that it might easily mislead a certain class of readers. So true is this that those who know nothing of Salimbene and his time would undoubtedly form a wrong estimate of both if they stayed their studies at Mr. Coulton's volume. By no means is it suggested that Mr. Coulton is ever intentionally prejudiced or unfair. It is, however, a matter of regret that he should have fallen such an easy captive to a thesis and that he, therefore, fails to do full justice to his subject. This is all the more to be regretted inasmuch as Mr. Coulton is such a learned mediæval scholar and so specially qualified to throw light on every part of the period covered by Salimbene's Chronicle.

So much by way of criticism of Mr. Coulton's work. All the rest must be praise. There is scarcely a dull passage in the nearly five hundred pages of "From St. Francis to Dante." The reader who is sufficiently familiar with the original text of Salimbene to discount the bias which tends to mar some portions, at least, of Mr. Coulton's commentary, will find his volume most thoughtful, suggestive and illuminating. Where Mr. Coulton has done a real service is in pointing out the limitations of some current interpretations of the thirteenth century which conceive the story of that wonderful century to have been, as it were, all stained-glass and liturgy, knight-errantry and pageantry. As a wholesome cor-

rective to any such unhistorical glorification of the period that extends from St. Francis to Dante, a careful perusal of the Chronicle of Salimbene is much to be recommended.

Life and Characteristics of the Right Reverend Alfred A. Curtis, D. D., second bishop of Wilmington, Delaware. Compiled by the Sisters of the Visitation, Wilmington, Delaware. With a Preface by Cardinal Gibbons. P. J. Kennedy & Sons. New York, 1913. 8°. Pp. xiv + 446.

Notwithstanding the fact that Bishop Curtis desired before his death that none of his writings, and least of all his correspondence should survive him, a sufficiently large collection of scattered notes and letters has been brought together in this volume to give it the intimate, personal quality which good biography demands. Though the harvest is not superabundant, it is well distributed over many years, and consequently, it is easy, by means of those documents, to follow the various stages in the bishop's intellectual and spiritual activities from the time of his conversion, up to his death in 1908. From these written memorials and from the sympathetic account of his manifold activities as priest and bishop, the career of Bishop Curtis is revealed as that of a strong, independent, forceful and earnest man in whom there could be no compromise between conviction and conduct. He was born in Somerset County on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, and though his conversion to the Catholic Church severed many of the closest ties of his early life, he never ceased to be devotedly attached to the place of his birth and his early associations. The combination of Catholicity and sturdy unaffected manliness which he brought to his new faith made of him a singularly lovable and ardent pastor of souls. The career of Bishop Curtis contained nothing that was extraordinary or striking except his punctilious performance of what he conceived to be his duty, and his remarkable love and zeal in the service of God. Tirelessly and constantly he worked as missioner and pastor, and his work bore fruit under his eyes. The preparation of the biography of Bishop Curtis could not have fallen into better hands than those of the Visitation nuns in Wilmington, whose spiritual director he was for many years, and in

whose convent enclosure he found his last resting place. They are to be congratulated on having written a biographical sketch which is free from exaggeration and marked by simplicity and restraint. The second portion of this book which contains a series of notes, spiritual counsels, sermons, outlines for the exercises of retreats and extracts made by the bishop from the writings of the Fathers, are valuable as showing though imperfectly, his mind and purposes. For priests who are engaged in labors similar to those which occupied Bishop Curtis the book cannot fail to be an inspiration and a guide.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

L'Ascetisme chrétien pendant les trois premiers siecles de l'Église. Par F. Martinez, S. M. Docteur en Theologie. Paris. Gabriel Beauschesne, 1913. 8°. Pp. ix + 208.

A twofold purpose is achieved in this excellent monograph: Ante-Nicene ascetical practices are excellently delineated, and the link between the teaching of Our Lord and the rise of monasticism is clearly established. Protestant writers are frank in stating that on few points are they so much at variance with Catholics as on the subject of asceticism. Hence since the sixteenth century a flood of different theories has been loosed to explain the origin of monasticism as something alien to the teaching of Our Lord and foreign to the Gospel. Inasmuch as monasticism did not make its appearance until the fourth century, it has been denounced as an importation from non-Christian sources as something derived either from Judaism or paganism. The purpose of Protestant critics has been to point out similarities between Christian and Pagan ascetical practices and on this unsubstantial and insufficient basis to argue to a community of origin. The purpose of the present author is to show that, even admitting that such resemblances do exist, they are to be traced to the common modes through which the religious instincts of humanity find expression. He contents himself with arguing that ascetical practices are inseparable from religious earnestness; he might have gone further and asserted with Professor William James that ascetical practices are inseparable from serious effort at perfection in any field of endeavor, and that with

the comparatively limited range of human activity, these efforts even without a religious basis assume similar features. The peculiarity which attaches to Christian ascetical endeavor cannot by any means find its explanation in derivation from anterior phenomena of a similar character; but is intelligible only in view of the special purposes and the unique character of the Christian scheme of life and destiny.

The Protestant propaganda has been directed against monastic institutions in particular, as being unchristian in source and character, and hence the present work is directed against the weakest point in such a position, for, by establishing the existence of ascetical practices in the three first centuries, the link is shown which connects monasticism with the ascetical prescriptions of Our Lord and the Apostles. The author might have been less modest in considering that his work does not sufficiently explain how the Christian ascetics were led to the practice of the eremitical life; for the career of the solitary and the hermit was only one degree removed from that of the strict ascetic living in society, and any one of a hundred external circumstances will sufficiently explain this later development without recourse to a new and specifically distinct interior motive or impulse. In a general way this work covers the same ground as that of Schiewitz, but with more point and directness. Step by step from the words and teaching of Our Lord, the author traces the presence of ascetical prescription in the writings of the early Christian authors and of ascetical practice in the lives of the faithful down to the end of the third century. With the wealth of material at his disposal such a task was not difficult; but the author is to be congratulated for the manner in which he has set forth the fact that asceticism was not only common in the early church, but that it was approved and fostered by ecclesiastical authority. No one can doubt the timeliness of such a study, and it is to be hoped that the conclusions of the author will not escape the notice of some recent writers on the subject of early monasticism, notably Allen and Workman. Harnack, whom these authors follow, tacitly admits the evangelical basis for monasticism, when he argues that its earliest votaries sought for evangelical perfection by cutting themselves off from the secularized Church! When it is clearly demonstrated that ascetical practices prevailed at all times in the early Church, it

is not difficult to establish the relationship between asceticism and monasticism, for the latter is merely asceticism in a corporate form and the monastic rule merely a definite norm of ascetical observance. Western Christendom has always looked on St. Anthony as the Father of the eremitical life. The place of Pachomius and Schenoudi and Basil as monastic organizers is just as clearly established. The monastic institute once founded spread rapidly: but its claims were not blindly accepted, and later monastic legislators, such as Basil and Benedict, did not feel bound to commit themselves until they had studied its claims, and established to their own satisfaction its practical if not theoretical pre-eminence over the anchorite state.

It is not possible here to refer to the many interesting matters of detail with which this author deals in different parts of his work: but it is to be hoped, that the excellence of this study and its clearly demonstrated conclusions, will convince Protestant critics of monasticism that the Rule was the natural and logical sequel and outcome of three centuries of ascetical activity.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

Regesto dell' antica Badia di S. Matteo de Castello o Servorum Dei. Pubblicato a cura dei' Monaci di Montecassino. Badia di Montecassino, 1914. 8°. Pp. + 192.

The monastery of S. Matteo de Castello was situated a short distance from the more famous and more influential Monastery of Monte Cassino. Its history was closely bound up with the latter and it ended by having its estates turned over to the *mensa Abbatis* of Monte Cassino in the fifteenth century. The Regesta of the monastery which are here published contain principally documents dealing with gifts of lands or tenements to the monastery or deeds of sale. Very few refer to other subjects. There are in all seventy-five of these documents, sixty-five of which are taken from the Regesta of the monastery itself now preserved in manuscript at Monte Cassino, ten, added as an appendix, are derived from other sources. A short and interesting account of the monastery is found in the Introduction, together with a description of the MSS. and some paleographical notes. Photo-

graphic reproductions of some typical pages of the MSS., and a picture of the present condition of the ruins of the monastery are found at the end of the work. The dates of the documents range from 1038 to 1457, and taken all together they offer an interesting sidelight on the economic life of a mediæval Italian abbey.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

American Catholic Hymnal. By the Marist Brothers. P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 44 Barclay St. New York, 1914. 8vo. 512 pages. Price, $1.50; postpaid $1.68.

The full title of this book is as follows: "An Extensive Collection of Hymns, Latin Chants and Sacred Songs for Church, School and Home: Including Gregorian Masses, Vesper Psalms, Litanies, Motets for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, etc.: According to the *Motu Proprio* of His Holiness Pope Pius X.: Written, arranged and compiled especially for the Catholic Youth of the United States." The description is faithfully expressive of the contents.

The item "Including Gregorian Masses, etc." does not mean that any excessive development was given to the strictly liturgical part: for, out of 444 entries, 318 are in English.

In numberless parishes, the Hymnal Book represents and supplies a great part, sometimes almost the totality, of educational materials along the lines of sacred music. Moreover, the recent reform of liturgical music has forced its beneficial influences even on extra-liturgical matters like the singing in the vernacular, and to such an extent that the public of today disapproves of many a hymnal of former times and calls for radical improvements. Besides, there is a modern tendency to supplement Hymn Books with collections of easy and popular pieces of plain chant, and to associate such books with the movement of Gregorian restoration: a very laudable tendency.

Now, as an educational, and progressive, and Gregorian collection of songs, the American Catholic Hymnal is a very remarkable one.

But it is useless to praise it, as in such matters musical directors have to judge for themselves. When they know that such a book

has come out, and where it is to be found, they get a copy of it, and read it, and act according to their personal estimate.

Let them do so for the American Catholic Hymnal of the Marist Brothers.

ABEL L. GABERT.

Early Latin Hymnaries. An Index of hymns in hymnaries before 1100. With an Appendix from later sources. By James Mearns, M. A. Cambridge University Press, 1913. Pp. xx + 107.

The Index here printed was meant to be part of a volume on Hymns in a series of manuals of liturgical study but, when completed, it proved to be so bulky, that it was found necessary to publish it as a separate work. In its present form the Index provides a convenient handbook of reference for those interested in early Latin hymns and it gives a representative list of the Latin hymns actually in use throughout Europe before the year 1100. In order to show the continuity in the use of certain hymns during the mediæval period, some hymnaries of the twelfth century, with a few of a still later date, have been indexed by the author, who notes that many of these manuscripts have the ancient melody set to the hymns. The hundred and twenty-three hymns indexed in the volume before us are arranged in classes, according as they were written in England, France, Germany, Italy or Spain. Some verses of the hymn *Ter hora trina volvitur*, from a MS. written at S. Maximin, Trier, about 890, are reproduced as a frontispiece. Every student of early Latin hymnology must be grateful to the author for the labor and care that have gone to the making of this volume, which is a most important addition to the literature of the subject. The book itself is produced in that admirable fashion which we are accustomed to associate with everything coming from the Cambridge University Press.

S. Francis of Assisi: A Play in Five Acts. By M. Peladan. Translated by Harold John Massingham. New York, Scribners, 1913.

Granted the need of an English version of M. Peladan's drama, the present rendering of it leaves little to be desired from a literary point of view. Only one wonders why Mr. Massingham ever chose Elizabethan English for his translation, or rather adaptation, of the present play, more especially as there is so wide a difference between M. Peladan's French and the Elizabethan diction used in the version before us. As regards the play itself, it may be enough to say here that it is based on St. Clare's love for St. Francis and that, as a consequence, it places both Saints, along with their companions, in a position for which there is not the slightest warrant in history. It is, indeed, an extraordinary atmosphere to which we are transported. No doubt a dramatist who creates his characters is at liberty to create their positions also. But it is surely obvious that one who professes to deal with historic personages enjoys no such latitude. If a playwright attempts by dramatic license any romance of position in portraying historic personages, he is clearly bound to invent such positions only as shall square with the characters of these personages as they are already fixed in the pages of history. Against this elementary precept M. Peladan's play offends repeatedly. The last act, in particular, in so far as it introduces a Dominican friar to disturb St. Francis on his deathbed, is a gross travesty.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Unveiling of Bust of Cardinal Gibbons at The Catholic University of America.

At three o'clock Wednesday afternoon, April 22d, took place the unveiling of the bust of His Eminence, James Cardinal Gibbons, Chancellor of the Catholic University of America, presented to the Cardinal Gibbons Memorial Hall by Mr. Michael Jenkins, of Baltimore, Treasurer of the University. The presentation discourse was made by the Very Rev. P. C. Gavan, Pastor of the Sacred Heart Church, this city, for many years the Chancellor of Cardinal Gibbons. The bust was accepted in the name of the University by the Most Rev. John J. Glennon, Archbishop of St. Louis. Cardinal Gibbons was present on the occasion and surrounded by the Board of Trustees of the Catholic University, by its professors and students and the Heads of eight religious houses in the vicinity.

The bronze bust of the Cardinal is slightly over life size. The pedestal is of rosate marble and upon it is the coat of arms of the Cardinal, likewise in bronze. The bust is the work of J. Maxwell Miller, a distinguished sculptor of Baltimore, also a native and prize student of that city. Mr. Miller likewise executed the very handsome medallion, which was struck on the occasion of his double jubilee, and thought by many to be the most perfect bronze medallion ever executed in the United States.

The bust stands in the center of the beautiful Reception Lobby of the Cardinal Gibbons Memorial Hall. Around the Hall are cut in 16 large open panels as many beautiful bronze shields, upon which are inscribed, in Gothic lettering of red and black, the names of 113 principal benefactors of the Hall, persons who gave $500 or more towards its erection.

The event was an unusually historic and animated one, and marks the completion of the beautiful Memorial Hall, begun three years ago in honor of the double jubilee of Cardinal Gibbons, and recently completed at a total expense of $260,000. This large fund was entirely contributed by personal friends and admirers of the great patriotic Churchman, so that the noble edifice stands to-day

free of debt. It has rooms for 130 students, besides several large apartments, and a number of halls for social and administrative purposes.

Discourse of Rev. P. C. Gavan.

Your Eminence, Most Reverend and Right Reverend Fathers, and Gentlemen of the Board of Trustees:—

It is with feelings of the keenest pleasure and with a deep sense of the honor conferred upon me that I make the formal presentation to you of the Bust of the Most Eminent Chancellor of this University. I need hardly say, however, that I am presenting it, not in my own, but in the name of one whose unaffected simplicity of character makes him shrink from all public demonstrations whatsoever, especially those in which he is himself personally concerned, —I speak, of course, of Mr. Michael Jenkins, of Baltimore. And while Mr. Jenkins' interest in the University in general has never flagged from the beginning, he has conceived a pronounced attachment to this magnificent Memorial Hall in particular, on account of his profound esteem and affectionate reverence for the distinguished prelate in whose honor it has been erected.

In presenting his gift, the esteemed donor has been influenced by two predominant motives. The first is to stamp the name of Cardinal Gibbons so clearly and unequivocally on this Hall that all who enter its portals may know at once its meaning, and desire to learn its history; to instill the breath of life into the dead stones by placing in the very centre and heart of the building a life-like and speaking portrait of the man who has in such large measure been the very life and eloquent voice of the University from its birth; and finally to enshrine, if I may say so, a jewel of the plastic art in the beautiful architectural setting so richly and admirably prepared to receive it. And this representation in bronze of the Cardinal is indeed a work of fine art, of consummate skill, and exquisite workmanship. It is a consoling proof too that the divinity which rules over the domain of sculpture does not always limit her favors to any one country or fixed period of time, but will condescend on occasion, as in this instance, to guide the fingers and illumine the brain of earnest and inspiring American youth.

The second motive of the donor takes a loftier flight. It is to keep ever before the eyes of the students of future generations,

both ecclesiastical and lay, whose numbers, we can now safely predict, will be legion upon legion, a worthy and lasting reminder of the first Chancellor of this great University, its devoted protector, its one time savior, its constant and generous friend;—a lasting and eloquent reminder also of the eminent Churchman whose life and works have shed so much glory on the Catholic Church and the Catholic name in the United States.

May this noble Bust then tell to all who behold it the splendid story of the long and brilliant life which was ever consecrated first, last, and all the time to the highest possible ideals in religion, in true patriotism, and in Christian education, and may the knowledge thus acquired be an inspiration to them towards the highest spiritual and intellectual endeavor and achievement.

For the lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime.

The Judge John M. Mitchell Memorial Law Library.

The Trustees of the Catholic University of America at their stated meeting on Wednesday, April 22, 1914, by vote established THE JUDGE JOHN M. MITCHELL MEMORIAL LAW LIBRARY. This action was made possible through the generosity of Misses Agnes and Marion L. Mitchell of Concord, New Hampshire, who wishing to perpetuate their father's memory, made their gift on the following conditions:—

"I. The Law Library of our deceased father shall be installed permanently in the School of Law of the Catholic University of America, and it shall be designated and known always as:

The Judge John M. Mitchell Memorial Law Library."

"The Law Library of our deceased father shall be kept intact always in the School of Law of the Catholic University of America for reference use only, and no book in it shall be taken from the School of Law of the Catholic University of America for circulation purposes."

"III. The Catholic University shall erect in its School of Law a fitting tablet commemorating the life of our deceased father, and shall place above the books, that he prized so highly, a picture of him, which we will donate."

"IV. Our father's name, Judge John M. Mitchell, and our

deceased mother's name, Mrs. Julia C. Mitchell, shall be placed on the roll of the "Deceased Benefactors" of the Catholic University of America."

"V. Our names, Agnes Mitchell and Marion L. Mitchell, shall be placed now on the roll of the "Living Benefactors," and at our deaths shall be transferred to the roll of the "Deceased Benefactors" of the Catholic University of America."

"VI. The Trustees of the Catholic University of America at their stated meeting on Wednesday, April 22, 1914, shall by vote accept our gift on the conditions, that we have here mentioned."

Judge John M. Mitchell was born at Plymouth, July 6, 1849, the oldest child of John and Honora (Doherty) Mitchell, who came to this country from Ireland in 1848. When John M. Mitchell was born his father was employed in the work of building the Boston, Concord and Montreal Railroad, but soon after he engaged in farming, and Judge Mitchell's boyhood days were spent upon a Vermont farm, much of the time in Salem now a part of Derby. He attended the District School and at the age of fifteen entered Derby Academy. His course there was interrupted now and then for the purpose of teaching, his first position being in the town of Holland when he was sixteen years of age. He taught for six consecutive winters, and at the age of nineteen became Superintendent of Schools of the town of Salem, remaining there two years.

He began the study of law with Edwards and Dickerman at Derby, but in 1870 entered the office of Harry and George A. Bingham of Littleton. He was admitted to the bar in 1872, and was at once taken into partnership with Harry Bingham, which continued until the death of the latter in 1900. In 1881 a branch office was opened at Concord, and Judge Mitchell went there to reside. Before moving from Littleton he had served the town during two terms at Selectman, and the County as Solicitor from 1879 until his removal to Concord.

In Concord he served in the Legislature at the session of 1893 and in the Constitutional Conventions of 1902 and 1912 from ward 4, although it was a strong Republican ward and he was a steadfast member of the Democratic party. At the last convention he was the Chairman of the Standing Committee on the Judicial

Department. He was also the minority party member of the Railroad Commission from 1888 to 1891, when he resigned. He served as a member of the Democratic State Committee of New Hampshire for many years and was Chairman of the Democratic State Convention of 1888. In 1903, he was Democratic nominee for the United States Senate. He was for nine years a member of the Concord Board of Education, serving as the chairman, but declined further renomination. He was for many years a trustee of the New Hampshire State Hospital, and a trustee of the Margaret Pillsbury Hospital of Concord.

In a professional way he was prominent, having been identified with the most momentous railroad litigation that concerned the Courts of New Hampshire for a third of a century. His firm was leading counsel against the leasing of railroads from 1878 to 1884; for the Concord road from 1884 to 1888; for the Concord and Montreal, successors to the Concord, from 1891 to 1895, and for the Boston and Maine, successor to the Concord and Montreal, as its chief counsel in New Hampshire from 1907 till his appointment to the Bench in 1910. His practice was as broad as the civil docket, and in such cases he frequently appeared before the Court in every County in the State of New Hampshire, and before legislative committees in great number. He was entrusted with much probate business, having administered many large estates, and at the time of his death was still trustee of several.

He was the advisor of the Bishop of Portland (Me.) in all civil matters in New Hampshire for years before the creation of the Diocese of Manchester (N. H.) in 1883. Subsequently, the late, lamented Bishop John B. Delaney gave him unfaltering trust, and he had the confidence of Rt. Rev. George A. Guertin, D. D., the present Bishop of Manchester.

He was appointed a Judge of the Superior Court of New Hampshire by Gov. Henry B. Quinby on September 7, 1910, and was most active in the work of his position till his death on March 4, 1913. John H. Riedell, Law Reporter of the Supreme Court of New Hampshire has given the following estimate of Judge Mitchell:

"John M. Mitchell was successful as a lawyer because of his ability and industry, his unquestioned integrity, his unswerving loyalty, and his absolute honesty and fairness in dealing with

fellow members of the bar; and the qualities which brought him success as a practitioner made him an able, useful and universally respected judge. I knew him well for more than thirty years, and I believe the world is better for his having lived in it."

On November 19, 1874, he was married to Miss Julia C. Lonergan, whose death antedated his by nine weeks. Two daughters, the donors of his Memorial, survive. Those who knew him best, say that his home life was ideal.

Judge John M. Mitchell was the first Catholic elevated to the Bench of the Superior Court of New Hampshire, and his career was an apt illustration of the success of the practical Catholic in an erstwhile unsympathetic environment. His life will serve as an inspiration to present and future students in the Law School of the Catholic University of America.

THOMAS C. CARRIGAN.

Basselin College: A New University Foundation for Ecclesiastics.

By the will of Theodore B. Basselin, of Croghan, N. Y., who died there April 19, 1914, the University will receive the residue of his estate, amounting to five hundred thousand dollars or more, for the purpose of providing a college for youthful aspirants to the priesthood, to be known as BASSELIN COLLEGE.

Of this sum one hundred thousand dollars may be expended for a building to be known as Basselin Hall.

The students of this College will be taken regularly from Catholic colleges, and will spend at the foundation the senior college year and two years devoted to the study of philosophy and the elements of certain ecclesiastical sciences. During these three years they are to receive, moreover, a special and regular training by good masters in all the arts and graces of ecclesiastical speaking and singing, so that they may enter the theological seminary well prepared for their formation as preachers of the Word of God.

The generous founder of this new college was particularly anxious that only the brightest and most promising young men should be taken, and that during the three years of their preliminary ecclesiastical formation, they should be drilled and trained with great care to the free and perfect use of the voice in reading the

Gospel and Epistle, in making the parochial announcements and communications, in the singing of the Holy Mass and all other services, in pulpit discourses and the conduct of societies. He was desirous that the Word of God should be announced in the churches with all the dignity that becomes its divine character and its absolute necessity.

Deeply religious by nature and life, he loved the Catholic Church profoundly and was persuaded that he could not better employ his large fortune than in making a perpetual provision for the best possible training of the young levites in one of their most essential duties.

The Catholic University of America will cherish the memory of Theodore Basselin as one of its principal benefactors. The noble foundation that he has created is unique in the history of ecclesiastical education, and cannot fail in time to influence favorably the regular training of ecclesiastics in all our seminaries.

Possibilities also of healthy growth on the part of such a solid foundation naturally suggest themselves, and there are good reasons for hoping that in connection with this foundation, ecclesiastical studies at the University may take on, in the more or less near future, that development which befits the present conditions and needs of the American Catholic Clergy.

We earnestly beg all the priestly graduates of the University to remember frequently at the Altar this generous and high-minded benefactor of the ecclesiastical order, likewise in all their prayers and good works, that he may soon enjoy the vision of the Glorious Redeemer whom he so loved on earth and whose Holy Church he served with such efficient and enduring love.

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

Meeting of the Trustees. The meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Catholic University took place on Wednesday morning, April 22nd, at 10 o'clock, and those attending were: His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, Most Rev. Sebastian G. Messmer, Archbishop of Milwaukee; Most Rev. John J. Glennon, Archbishop of St. Louis; Most Rev. James H. Blenk, Archbishop of New Orleans; Most Rev. Edmond F. Prendergast, Archbishop of Philadelphia; Most Rev. J. J. Keane, Archbishop of Dubuque; Right Rev. Camillus P. Maes, Bishop of Covington; Right Rev. John S. Foley, Bishop of Detroit; Right Rev. Thos. J. Shahan, Rector of the University; Mr. Michael Jenkins, of Baltimore, Md.; The Honorable Thomas Kerns, and Mr. Walter George Smith, of Philadelphia.

Many important matters were discussed, and the budget for the coming year was made up.

The Board decided to build at once a new Chemical Laboratory, at a cost of $150,000, and which will be 280 feet long by 50 feet broad, and three stories in height. This laboratory will be ready, in part at least, for the opening of the scholastic year, and will be fitted up with everything necessary for the best undergraduate work in chemistry, and particularly for research work of the highest kind. Ample provisions are made for every demand of chemical science, and in the construction of the new building the best experience of the latest high grade research laboratories will be utilized. The construction of the building and its equipment will be under the personal supervision of Very Reverend John J. Griffin, Professor of Chemistry at the Catholic University.

The Trustees unanimously expressed themselves as very highly satisfied with the rapid and solid progress of the University, both in the number of students and the quality and efficiency of the new buildings.

Shahan Debating Society. The Third Annual Prize Debate of the Shahan Society was held in McMahon Hall on the evening of April 27. The Question was: "*Resolved:* That the best interests of Society are served by a system of public pensions to needy widows with young children." On the Affirmative side were Messrs. John M. Russell, William F. Cronin, and Joseph F. Gunster; on the Negative, Messrs. Patrick L. Kirby, John J. Burke and Denis M. McDonough. The Judges, Hon. Henry F. Ashurst, U. S. Senator from Arizona, Hon. Thomas J. Walsh, U. S. Senator from Montana, and Very Rev. Dr. Pace, decided in favor of the Negative.

Lecture on Sociology. On Wednesday, April 22, Dr. Samuel McCune Lindsay, Head of the School of Political Science of Columbia University, lectured in McMahon Hall on "The New Profession of Social Service."